

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. XX.

---

DECEMBER, 1840.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### PLAINNESS, AS A QUALITY OF SERMONS.

IT is to be regretted, that our language furnishes no unequivocal word for expressing that general quality in discourses, by which they become readily and fully intelligible to their hearers. The word *intelligible* is not sufficient to designate this excellence; for some discourses are susceptible of being understood, though not without severe and prolonged effort. The word *simple* is sometimes used to denote the quality of being readily and easily understood; but is also used to denote naturalness and unaffectedness of style. The word *popular* is likewise equivocal, being not only applied to discourses fitted for the general comprehension, but also to those which are well received by the public.\* *Perspicuous* is the term by which the quality is often indicated; but this term is too specific for our purpose; it applies to the language of a discourse rather than to the discourse as a whole; to the characteristic of a medium, rather than of what is seen through that medium. It is a figurative term, designating the transparency of the glass which has no flaw, and which we look through (*perspicio*) without impediment; but we wish a term to express

---

\* The Germans express the quality now under consideration by the words, *Simplicität* and *Popularität*. See a valuable work of Fr. Wilh. Hesse, *Ueber Popularität und Simplicität im Predigen*.

the transparency of the object also which is seen behind that glass. We sometimes hear, indeed, of a perspicuous arrangement or argument, but not often of a perspicuous doctrine, thought or theme. The word *plain* is likewise ambiguous, denoting free from art or ornament, honestly rough, faithful in reproof, and also easily and fully intelligible. The last meaning, however, is one element of all its other meanings when it is applied to discourses; and therefore this term will be used throughout the present article in preference to the others, though not in exclusion of them. The word *clear* is in some respects more suitable to our purpose than either of the preceding, yet is often used as nearly synonymous with *undeniable*, and does not equally with the word *plain* stand in obvious and striking opposition to excessive metaphor, artificial constructions and complicated arrangement. But whatever term we employ, the thing to be now considered is, that general quality of a sermon, of its phraseology and plan and thought, by which it becomes not merely susceptible of being understood, but of being understood without hesitation and doubt; by which the thought is presented to the mind like light to the eye; not needing to be searched after, but obtruding itself upon the organ; being perceived not merely because we chose to perceive it, but if the eye be open, whether we choose or not.\*

This subject is so important, that it has become a hackneyed one, and for this very reason demands a renewed examination. It is upon the hackneyed theme, especially when fundamental, that many are apt to form the most superficial and injurious notions. We shall be called to criticise some of the oft-repeated canons on this subject, while we consider, as we now propose to do, the proper standard of plainness in sermons. How far shall this quality be carried? What degree of it shall we aim to acquire?

It may be needless to say, in the first place, that discourses should not be so plain as to seem low and vulgar.

---

\* Id ipsum in consilio est habendum, non semper tam esse acrem iudicis intentionem, ut obscuritatem apud se ipse discutiat, et tenebris orationis inferat quoddam intelligentiae suaे lumen: sed multis eum frequenter cogitationibus avocari, nisi tam clara fuerint, quae dicemus, ut in animum ejus oratio, ut sol in oculos, etiamsi in eam non intendatur, incurrat. Quare non, ut intelligere possit, sed ne omnino possit non intelligere, curandum. Propter quod etiam repetimus saepe quae non satis percepisse eos, qui cognoscunt, putamus.—*Quintil. Inst., Lib. VIII, § 2.*

We use the word *seem*, rather than *be*; for lowness and vulgarity are relative terms, and it were unjust to condemn every thing in every place, which would offend the tastes of some refined hearers in some places. By so doing we should condemn the Bible. There is a standard of true dignity; and, though we may not be able to fix this standard with exactness, we may decide confidently upon certain approximations to it. We may settle the principle, that a minister should never sink beneath the standard adopted by his audience, or justify any suspicion in any of them that he is degraded in his intellect or sensibilities. It is not true, that a low expression is always plainer than a dignified one. As one part of an audience cannot understand a learned phrase, so another part will not understand a rude phrase. Cultivated minds feel the significancy of a vulgar remark not much more than vulgar minds feel the force of a literary abstraction. When we have read in the sermons of a certain popular writer such expressions as this, "The conduct of inconsistent Christians makes the devil laugh," we have felt that this writer's style is liable to the very objection which he so often makes to scholastic discourses; the force of it cannot be appreciated by some of his readers. His strong words fall powerless upon many ears which are not attuned to this mode of speech. Low sayings suggest to a delicate mind a very different notion from that which their author intended. Their repulsive form prevents their designed signification from even entering that soul which is so sensitive as to shut itself up against every apparent rudeness. And there are many vulgarized idioms, which the vulgar, who so often use them, do not themselves understand. It is truly observed by Dr. Campbell, "that in some popular systems of religion, the zeal of the people is principally exerted in support of certain favorite phrases, and a kind of technical and idiomatical dialect to which their ears have long been inured, and which they consequently imagine they understand, but in which often there is nothing to be understood."\*

It must always be remembered, that the word *perspicuity* indicates a certain relation between what is said and the

---

\* See *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, b. II, ch. 7. See also Foster's *Essay on the aversion of men of taste to evangelical religion*, Letters 4 and 5.

character of him who hears, and that the same discourse is plain to one hearer and unintelligible to another.\* When, therefore, the writer on homiletics addresses to preachers the advice of Cromwell to his soldiers, "Fire low," we must remember the danger of firing too low; and that he is as unskilful who discharges his ammunition into the earth under the feet, as he who discharges it into the air over the head of those whom he aims at. Says Wesley to one of his lay assistants, "Clearness is necessary for you and me, because we are to instruct people of the lowest understanding; therefore we, above all, if we think with the wise, must yet speak with the vulgar.† We should constantly use the most common little easy words (so they are pure and proper) which our language affords." Now the same Wesleyan wisdom, which prompts the selection of the most common little easy words for people of the lowest understanding, will allow a more refined phraseology for hearers of a less vulgar stamp. We smile at the simple-heartedness of Thomas Hanson, one of Wesley's adherents, when he says, "I am a brown-bread preacher, that seek to help all I can to heaven, in the best manner I can." We feel thankful that there are some preachers made of this home-made, yet wholesome material, but we need not insist that every one be a Thomas Hanson, or adopt his brown style.

In the second place, a sermon should not be so plain as to appear common and trite. We say *appear* rather than *be* trite, for what is common-place to one audience is fresh instruction to another, and it is a universal rule, that a preacher should never sink below the standard of his hearers. If he do so, he may not be even intelligible to them. A sermon so simple as to appear childish, so clear as to seem shallow, will not be attended to, and the ability of a listless mind to understand a meagre preaching may be less than that of an interested mind to comprehend a rich and original discourse. By constantly rewarding the attention of our hearers, we may sharpen that attention the more; and as their mental activity increases, we may gratify their cravings with stronger and deeper thought.

\* The glass is without a flaw, but some cannot see through it on account of their distance from it.

† The old maxim of Roger Ascham was, "We ought to think like great minds, and speak like the common people."

We may keep up the proportion between their perspicacity and the depth or volume of our teachings. A discourse is made plain, not so often by the commonness of its phrases as by the fitness of the whole composition to awaken the inquisitiveness of the hearers. Let its plan be suited to excite curiosity, let its constructions be uninvolved, its sentences unincumbered with needless parentheses and tautologies, its language definite and pure, and the hearers will grasp its dense meaning more easily than if a single one of its thoughts were expanded well nigh to evaporation. When they listen to words which have been called the monuments rather than the signs of ideas; to "the perfect vulgar of pious authorship; an assemblage of the most subordinate materials that can be called thought in language, too grovelling to be called style;" when they say of their preacher as Bassanio said of Gratiano, "He speaks an infinite deal of nothing; his reasons are as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff; you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have found them, they are not worth the search," the consequence is, the hearers lose the character of hearers, their minds are diverted to other objects, and the plainest style is not perspicuous, like glass, to an audience who are looking out at the windows. When the mechanic's chisel is blunt, he applies the more strength; when the material to be cut is hard, he may prepare it for the operation by a solvent; and if the preacher would be understood, he must perform a preliminary work upon the faculties which are to understand him, must secure an interested attention, must arrange his thoughts so as to force an entrance into the soul, must make his hearers co-workers with himself, and they will press through brakes of argument impassable to sluggish minds. Interesting thought often gives perspicuity to style. When the logical structure of a sermon is good, it often makes the rhetorical garb transparent. Adam Smith's discussion of doctrines in political economy is far clearer to a sound mind than Miss Martineau's Illustrations. Though Philip Henry says, "I never think that I can speak plain enough, when I am speaking about souls and their salvation," we may still query whether a sermon may not be so simple as to shut up the very minds it was intended to open; whether plainness may not cease to be such when it sinks into truisms.

"Optimi," says Luther, "ad vulgus hi sunt concionatores qui pueriliter, populariter, et simplicissime docent." But with the vulgar of our own land and time there are classed many strong, shrewd, inquisitive, speculating, reading men and women, who, as soon at least as the higher classes, will turn with loathing from any preaching that deals in puerile dilutions. We would by no means overlook the wise import of Luther's remark. Like many prescriptive rules in homiletics, it was made for the peasantry of the old world. The canons laid down for the instruction of English weavers and French vine-dressers are applicable to some auditries among us; but an undistinguishing application of them to our free, inquiring, well-schooled yeomen, merchants and mechanics, has imparted a hurtful air of common-place to many discourses. "There are always," says Fenelon, "three quarters of an ordinary congregation, who do not know those first principles of religion in which the preacher supposes every one to be fully instructed." Writing under the influence of such a statement, as if it were made for our own latitude and longitude, some preachers among us may attain their appropriate measure of simpleness; but others will grievously underrate the capabilities of their audience, will become trite preachers for children, but will be outgrown by men, and even the children themselves will soon look down upon such insipidness, leaving it for younger folks than they.

Thirdly, a discourse need not always be so plain as to be intelligible to every individual in the audience. "A divine," says Dean Swift, "has nothing to say to the wisest congregation of any parish in this kingdom, which he may not express in a manner to be understood by the meanest of them." It is readily admitted, that when the subject and the occasion will allow, our sermons should be level to the most ordinary comprehensions. But is there not meat for strong men, as well as milk for babes? Does not one who is weak eat herbs only, and another eat all things? Shall not the most learned in the auditory receive his word in season, as well as the most imbecile? Shall the higher truths be entirely excluded from the pulpit, because all the hearers are not of the higher intellectual class? Are there not some sentiments which none but a pious man can fully comprehend, and shall

they find no place in sermons, because the impenitent will denounce them as enigmas? When Pitt accompanied his friend Wilberforce to hear Mr. Cecil preach, the prime minister declared that he could not understand a word of the discourse; but the discourse was doubtless profitable to all whose susceptibilities had been quickened by the Holy Spirit.\* We would condemn all needless elevation, either of sentiment or style; we would acquiesce in the general remark of Augustine, "It is better for critics to censure than for the people not to understand." But there are times when the improvement of a whole parish will be accelerated by the particular improvement of a few individuals. The higher intellect should sometimes, for the sake of the lower, content itself with a reduced amount of thought in a discourse; and the weaker intellect should sometimes, for the sake of the stronger, submit to a style designed for the masters in Israel. Every where, in such a world as this, there must be occasional accommodations between the high and the low. And the difficulty of making these accommodations is not always so great as may at first appear. Ignorant men are not always unwilling to hear an erudite discourse, and to be thought capable of understanding it. They are sometimes

---

\* It may be proper to notice here the distinction made by some between subjective and objective obscurity; between that which arises from a defect in the person addressed, and that which arises from a defect in the person addressing. Subjectively a work may be obscure, when it is objectively perspicuous. Thus, Euclid's Elements are unintelligible to a child, not on account of their bad arrangement or style, but on account of the child's want of discipline. Many, advocating the rule that a discourse be intelligible to every hearer, will yet justify a style of discourse for Christians which is unintelligible to the impenitent. The obscurity, they say, arises not from any fault in the discourse, but from a fault in the impenitent hearer, and therefore is no violation of the most rigid rule of plainness. But if a *moral* defect in a hearer will free an unintelligible sermon from the charge of obscurity, why may not an *intellectual* defect in the hearer have the same exculpatory influence? Why, then, would Clark on the Attributes be condemned as obscure to a common audience, since it is written as perspicuously as it well can be? The distinction between subjective and objective perspicuity, though valid, does not supersede the fact that all perspicuity is relative; and when there is a defect in the hearer, the discourse must be accommodated to that defect, in order to be *perfectly* plain. Reid's Philosophy is perhaps as perspicuous as need be for cultivated minds; but it is not so perspicuous as it ought to be, if it were designed for children.

happy in praying that the logical discourse which overtopped their comprehension may be the instrument of good to those whose heart is haughty, and whose eyes are lofty, and who exercise themselves in great matters. Learned men, also, are not always unwilling to sacrifice their own tastes to those of the community. They sometimes consider that the Sabbath is the chief day for the instruction of the poor, and, unless this instruction be given them, ignorance will be their continued heritage; whereas the learned may consult libraries on theology, and have numerous avenues to religious improvement. They sometimes reflect that the gospel was originally addressed to the ignorant, and has peculiar beauties when applied to the relief of mental poverty. Besides, on the Sabbath, they sometimes feel unprepared for laborious analysis, and prefer such discourses as will give them a day of intellectual rest. They desire a change of mental occupation.\* Still further, learned men are often unlearned in divine truth, and feel their need of simple, didactic address. It is not asserted, that either the higher or the lower orders are so accommodating at all times. The preacher must occasionally leave one class unsatisfied, for the sake of benefiting another. And there are many parishes where he should consult the tastes of the multitude more frequently than the tastes of the select and erudite; where, in the words of Bacon, "he should be too plain, rather than not plain enough." But his preferences for the multitude should never be exclusive. If he always overlook the peculiar necessities of the learned, for the sake of always meeting the specific wants of the ignorant, he will unduly neglect the aggregate of spiritual worth in

---

\* There is an incident in the life of Edmund Burke, which illustrates, not only the religious character of the man, but also the general principle that literary men often wish an entire alternation of their mental habits on the Sabbath. "At church, one day, he was unexpectedly saluted with a political sermon, which, though complimentary to his own views of public affairs, was so little suited in his opinion to the place, that he displayed unequivocal symptoms of disapprobation, by rising frequently, taking his hat, as if to depart, and re-seating himself, with evident chagrin. 'Surely,' said he, on another occasion, 'the church is a place where one day's truce may be allowed to the dissensions and animosities of mankind.' "—*Prior's Life of Burke, Ch. XI.* So men often desire one day's truce from the severities of logical or philological discussion.

his audience. In all places this is injurious; in some more so, in others less. We are therefore led to say,

In the fourth place, the preacher should adopt that degree of plainness which will be fitted to secure on the side of piety the greatest amount of mental and moral strength which he can hope to secure in his congregation. It is not asserted, that he should invariably adapt himself to the greatest intellects in his congregation; for these have not always the greatest moral power, and they are sometimes beyond the reach of hope. It is not asserted, that he should immediately adapt himself to the greatest number of minds. This he should do generally; but the balance of spiritual value does not always lie with the balance of numbers. "Men are to be weighed, not counted." It were a dangerous error, to suppose that any soul is unimportant, and also to suppose that every soul is equally important with every other.\* If the greatest amount of mental and moral strength is gained for the church, then the greatest amount of holiness is secured,—the greatest sum of capacity for enjoying and glorifying God. Besides, the soul of a single individual sometimes sways a community. The public cast their judgment into the mould of his; his salvation is the means under God of saving a multitude. The preacher, who neglects the more vigorous and expanded mind, and devotes his whole time to that which is less susceptible of knowledge and happiness, is like a husbandman who neglects the verdant field for the sake of a rock-bound common. The field is the more infested with weeds, because of its richness, and the labor upon the arid plain will yield insufficient sustenance to the laborer. That soul which the minister neglects becomes a Voltaire or a Gibbon, tearing down more than all the minister builds up. The presence of several such minds in a congregation should modify somewhat the style of preaching to that congregation. The style should be adapted to them, not indeed more than to all others, but in many places more than to an equal number of minds less capable of exploits for God. We preach to the aged, and again to the young; to the

\* Such remarks as the following are more common than just: "Men of taste form a very small part of the community, *of no greater consequence in the eyes of their Creator than others.*"—ROBERT HALL.

recently converted, and then to the inquiring, and afterwards to the hardened sinner; why not preach occasionally to that class of minds which were made for extensive influence upon the community? If half of a congregation should be unlettered laborers, and half should be inquisitive philosophers, the major amount of spiritual strength would be with the philosophers; the preacher should, exceptions apart, follow the preponderance; he should give to the laborers their proportion of the bread of life; no less, no more. Instead of allowing the dominant influence in the congregation to be unregulated, he should address himself to the philosophers, that through them he may affect the whole parish. When a preacher, in his eagerness to benefit the most imbecile of his hearers, offends the taste of a few leading spirits, his policy often proves a suicidal one. The intelligent men rise against him; their opposition is a signal for general revolt; even the weak things of his parish are swept into the vortex of his opponents; and in striving for the small men, he loses both the small and great. When a sermon is addressed to mature minds, the child wrestles about, and whispers and plays, for he does not understand it; but at the evening catechising he sees the effect of that address in the motions and countenance of his parents; he reads that discourse in their example through the week. It was the means of a father's or a mother's conversion, and its influence upon them may be continued, even to the renovating of this impatient child. The discourse was adapted to him indirectly; if it had been accommodated directly to his wants, he might have wept for an hour or two, but his disaffected, disgusted parents might have trifled away his seriousness before the setting of the sun.

The objection has been made to such an elevated style of preaching as is required by this rule, that it deprives the more ignorant classes of their appropriate Sabbath instructions. The first answer to this objection is, they are often benefited indirectly by what they do not understand. The spinster and the drayman slept under the sermon, for the sermon was over their heads; but the lawyer and the physician were subdued by it, and in their example this sermon still preaches to the inferior minds, who are thus illuminated by its reflected light. If the sermon had been levelled to the most degraded intellect, it

might have gained the weaklings of the parish; but in the day of stern combat, they might have been carried captive by the strong men who were irritated against the truth by the inanities of this very sermon. Is it no part of ministerial wisdom, to look at the hinges on which society is turning, and to keep them in good condition? Is it not a labor-saving policy, to impregnate the fountains of influence with sweetness, rather than devote exclusive attention to the streams, which, however tinctured, will always receive the flavor of the fountain? The second answer to this objection is, that men are sometimes benefited directly by what they do not understand. They learn that truth is ample, and their minds are too narrow to entertain it, and that humility is their befitting garment. Against a proposal for separating the children of a congregation from the adults; for holding children's meetings, where sermons, hymns and prayers shall be in keeping with the infantile mind, and where the youngest lisper can understand the whole, a Unitarian divine, who has but little regard for some of the mysteries of the gospel, exclaims indignantly, "Understand! I am almost weary of the word, when applied, as it often is, to that mighty theme in which the first step is the idea of the infinite God."\* And it is true, that when children in years or intellect learn from a long and hard sermon the superiority of divine truth to themselves, they understand the first lesson of faith and duty. But a third reply is, men are often edified by the general tenor of a discourse, when they do not comprehend many of its details. They catch here and there a valuable thought, and feel the warmth of a sermon which has many parts "dark with excessive bright." A fourth reply is, the weaker as well as the stronger are to have their own holidays for instruction. The elevated style is by no means to be continuous. The preacher is sometimes to request tacitly, as Augustine did openly, that, "as the plain and illiterate could not rise to the height of the learned, the learned would condescend to accommodate themselves to the ignorant." In what proportions he should divide the word, will be determined by his good sense, aided by his benevolent heart. When

\* Rev. Dr. Frothingham, in a sermon preached at Chauncey Place, Boston.

Martin Luther was asked by Dr. Albert the best mode of preaching before the Elector, he said, "Let all your preaching be in the most plain manner. Look not to the prince, but to the plain, simple, unlearned people, of which cloth the prince himself is also made. If I, in my preaching, should have regard to Philip Melancthon, or other learned doctors, I should work but little good. I preach in the simplest way to the unskilful, and the same giveth content to all."\* *Whenever it is the fact*,—and sometimes it is the fact,—that the simplest style of preaching gives content to all our hearers, and is the most useful to the majority,—whenever our Philip Melancthon and our Elector are in no danger of becoming a Hume and a Frederic under our dilutions of truth, this style may be adopted more frequently than when the preponderating intellect will be left pining and querulous for richer nutriment. It is to be distinctly remembered by the objector, that the rule under consideration does not relate to every sermon, but to the whole course of sermons. It is not that every sermon should be peculiarly adapted to the more intelligent, or to the less intelligent; for many of our sermons may be equally adapted to all. The rule is, that the whole series of our discourses, from year to year, should admit various modes of appeal; that it should preserve such an equiponderance between the conflicting demands of the hearers as to meet all these demands eventually in due proportion, and that the burden of the preacher's words should fall upon that solid mass of mind which constitutes the chief value of the audience. This mass of mind would, in most cases, be the majority of individuals; and in all cases we may expect that if the major amount of inward worth be gained for the church,

---

\* When Dr. Manton preached before the mayor of London, the court of aldermen, &c., at St. Paul's, he was heard with great admiration by the more intelligent part of his audience; but as he was returning from dinner, a poor man pulled him by the sleeve of his gown, and complained of the doctor's sermon, "for I could not understand a great part of what you said." "Friend," replied the doctor, "if I did not give you a sermon, you have given me one; and, by the grace of God, I will never play the fool to preach before my lord mayor in such a manner again." But, perhaps, had it not been for an *occasional* sermon which, like this, displayed "great judgment and learning," Dr. Manton would never have exerted the influence which he did as preacher before the Parliament, and chaplain to the king.

the majority in numbers will be gained mediately, if not immediately.

Another objection to the elevated style of preaching required by this rule is, it will induce our unlettered hearers to abandon our ministry for that of other denominations. "They will leave our church for the conventicle." And will not the learned also abandon our conventicle for the church? Has not sad experience shown that an evangelical ministrant has sometimes disgusted intelligent men, merely because of their intelligence, and sent them away hungering to a rational, in distinction from a religious, table? And what if a parishioner, whose mind is not in sympathy with the average mind of our audience, does occasionally resort to a more homogeneous society, where he may hear the same truth in a more colloquial style? He may thereby free us from a hampering distraction of spirit in our aim to reach a heterogeneous assemblage, whose wants conflict with each other. Perhaps, also, he may receive more instruction where less is given; may learn more from a meagre sermon than he could from a compressed one; and, though he no longer drinks from a silver cup, he is refreshed by the same water of life from an earthen pitcher.\* Some of our evangelical denominations differ from each other chiefly in degree of mental culture, in taste, in comprehension of mind. Let us not be too much grieved, when an individual passes from one form of truth to a different form of the same truth. But our rule does not require such a recondite mode of address as will dissatisfy our auditory. At times, some "hungry sheep look up, and are not fed;" but not often enough to frighten them from the fold. The objector should not take an extreme view of this rule, but should consider it as it is explained and modified by the rules with which it is connected.

Fifthly, the style of preaching should be fitted in respect of plainness to instruct and elevate the whole congregation as much as possible. If, as has been recommended, the major amount of mind be improved, the whole will be, through sympathy. Both an excess and a deficiency of

\* "The moon gives a far greater light than all the fixed stars put together, although she is much smaller than any of them: the reason is, that the stars are superior and remote, but the moon is inferior and contiguous."—LA CON.

plainness may be ill-suited to elevate the average intellect of the community. If a preacher's sermon be too philosophical, or condensed, or abstract, he will be raised so high above his hearers that he cannot touch them, and take them by the hand and lift them from their low position. If his sermon be too familiar, he can reach his hearers, indeed; but cannot raise them upward. He can reach them, for he is among them, in the crowd,—perchance in the mob; but he ought to be above them. He should not stand on a level with his audience, in the same hollow with the lowest of them; nor should he stand on a platform beyond the reach of their intellectual sympathies; but he should be just high enough to raise them upward, just low enough to reach them, in order to raise them. The eagle, teaching her young to fly, hovers over their heads, and rises into the air; yet not so far as to be out of sight and hearing, and not lingering so near as to encourage them to remain in their nest.

The pulpit should be instructive, not merely with regard to doctrine, but with regard to language, also. According to some canons, not a word should be uttered from it which is not heard in familiar speech; and in the German language, there are dictionaries of the plainest terms, expressly for the preacher. "Among hard words," says Dean Swift, "I number likewise those which are peculiar to divinity, as it is a science; because I have observed several clergymen, otherwise little fond of obscure terms, yet in their sermons very liberal of those which they find in ecclesiastical writers; as if it were our duty to understand them, which I am sure it is not. And I defy the greatest divine to produce any law, either of God or man, which obliges me to comprehend the meaning of omniscience, omnipresence,\* ubiquity, attribute, beatific vision, with a thousand others so frequent in pulpits, any more than of eccentric, idiosyncrasy, entity, and the like." "I believe," he continues, "I may venture to insist farther, that many terms used in Holy Writ, particularly by St. Paul, might with more discretion be changed into plainer speech, except where they are introduced as

---

\* The celebrated Mr. Berridge also objected to the words *omnipotent* and *omniscient* in the pulpit, and recommended, in their stead, almighty and knowing all things.

a part of a quotation." Now we would not deny the propriety of sometimes paraphrasing the language of king James's translation into the more intelligible phraseology of modern taste. We despise the pedantic use of learned terms, and believe, with Quintilian, that weakness rather than wisdom is the nurse of pedantry.\* "The swiftest traveller," he says, "when he walks with a child, will give it his hand, and will take short steps, nor go more rapidly than his companion can keep pace with him." Dr. Campbell commends bishop Tillotson for his habit of reading his sermons to an aged and illiterate woman who lived with him, and of modifying his phraseology until she could understand it; and Dean Swift commends lord Falkland for consulting one of his female domestics with regard to the language even of his learned treatises, so that he might free it from all obscurity.† But may not a preacher use a term that was not previously known to his hearers, provided he so use it as to make it intelligible? What if an uncommon word be uttered, and the listlessness of the hearers be broken? They have to determine its meaning by its connection; they perform a rapid induction, and from the known phrases in the sentence infer the signification of the unknown. If this cannot be done, then let the preacher define his terms,—and he is an intellectual benefactor who makes two good words intelligible where only one was before. He who familiarizes his people with a more dignified vocabulary than that which they had previously adopted, prepares them for a more worthy habit of thinking and feeling. We presuppose that the uncommon words which the minister uses are pure and important. Some of our metaphysical divines have been fond of preaching about the immanent and emanent volitions. Now we care not to justify the use of

\* *Nam et prima est eloquentiae virfus perspicuitas, et, quo quis ingenio minus valet, hoc se magis attollere et dilatare conatur: ut statura breves in digitos eriguntur, et plura infirmi minantur. Nam tumidos et currupitos et tinnulos et quoconque alio cacozeliae genere peccantes certum habeo non virium sed infirmitatis vitio laborare; ut corpora non robore, sed valetudine inflantur, et recto itinere lapsi plerumque devertunt.*—*Inst., Lib. II, § 3.*

† See Campbell's Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence, and Swift's Works, Vol. VIII, p. 6. "Dr. Swift"—according to Faulkner—"pursued a like method of reading his works to the *unlearned*. Something similar is reported of Moliere."

such terms in the pulpit; but when a community are made to understand them, a passage is opened for the entrance of many analogous terms. If the popular conversation recognize the difference between immanent and emanent, it will be prepared to mark that between irruption and eruption, immigrate and emigrate, invoke and evoke, immerge and emerge, immersion and emersion, involve and evolve, and a host of others.\* It is a mistake to suppose that the unusual term is necessarily obscure; it is often more expressive, and therefore more intelligible, than the hackneyed one, which sounds like the vacant bell. But suppose that a word be sometimes perplexing. Shall our hearers make no effort to acquire religious knowledge? Will they not prize truth more highly, if they toil for it? Who was ever intellectually profited, without enduring some hardness? What if the hearer be sometimes driven to a quick analysis of a sentence, and to a struggle for its meaning? This is better than to lie idle. If the pulpit is an educator of the people, it must require the people to do something toward educating themselves; and it may enfeeble their minds, if it indulge unduly their love of ease, and keep them in such a state that even the words *omnipotence* and *omnipresence* shall sound like barbarisms. The influence upon the public character and conversation must be deleterious, if every divine should adopt the plan of a writer in the seventeenth century, "who, to shun the latinisms of immensity, eternity, penetrability, and others, useth these, all-place-ness, all-timeness, thorough-farenness, and abundance such like."†

\* Some preachers have taught their people from the pulpit the correct use of the terms *consciousness*, as distinguished from *conscience*, *volition*, as distinguished from *affection*, *conception*, as distinct from *imagination*, and many other terms important to the philosopher, theologian, and ordinary citizen.

† From an author quoted in Glanvil's *Essay concerning Preaching*, p. 14, Mr. Glanvil himself, after some severe remarks in reprobation of hard words in a sermon, and in praise of an obvious arrangement, observes, "What some say that (the arrangement) should be *cryptic*, to surprise the auditors, seems to me very vain and weak;" p. 39. And again, "The preacher should bring the doctrine to the understanding without *ambages* or terms of art;" p. 49. And further, "Which some affect in order to *ostentate* their skill and learning;" p. 42. A work like Glanvil's on the style of sermons, may properly admit some terms which

Sixthly. Preaching should be such in respect of plainness as to gain the hearers' esteem for their minister. If he be ambitious of displaying erudition, his people will perceive it, and despise him as a fop. It is the proper, though not always the greatest, degree of plainness, which ensures esteem. A severe satirist, toward the close of the seventeenth century, speaking of the irreverent conduct of many persons frequenting the churches under the pretext of worship, and manifesting their impatience by coughing and other symptoms of idle levity, says, "There's such a noise that nobody's a farthing the better for going to church! The parson loses all his fine quotations out of Gregory and Chrysostom, which cost him so many precious hours the Saturday before; the people lose the end of their coming to church, which was to hear those learned quotations," &c.\* But it is not only the appearance of aiming to display himself which degrades a minister, he is also dishonored if he appear to have nothing worthy of being exhibited; if he seem to be "preaching himself out."† The general conviction, that his resources are far from being exhausted, that he knows more than he says, is essential to the highest degree of esteem for him. The full impression of a preacher's superiority is not gained until it is said, "There was the hiding of his power." Though he should never display knowledge for the sake of ostentation, he may exhibit it when it is needed for the just impression of his authority to instruct, of his exalted office. George Herbert in his first sermon at Bemerton carried this principle to an extreme; yet by that sermon he acquired a capital of reputation for learning which he could live upon a long time afterward. He gave a standing evidence to his people, that he had the ability to astonish them with extensive lore, but chose for their good to feed them with food con-

---

sermons must exclude, but we cannot say of our author what Pope says of Longinus,

His own example strengthens all his laws,  
And is himself the great sublime he draws.

Even Mr. Pope also has received frequent criticism for this couplet in which an example is represented as Longinus himself.

\* Pulpit Oratory in the time of James I, pp. 37, 38.

† See the volume of M. J. A. Nebe, *Ueber die Gefahr sich auszupredigen*; in which he states the causes which lead to, and the means of guarding against, the evil of a man's "preaching himself out."

venient for them. When we consider the prevalent tastes of his age, we may not indeed commend his maiden effort to the imitation of modern divines, but may query whether he were a loser by preaching in the course of his life one discourse imparting a true idea of his erudition. "In which first sermon," says Izaac Walton, "he gave his parishioners many necessary, holy, safe rules for the discharge of a good conscience both to God and man; and delivered his sermon after a most (florid) manner, both with great learning and eloquence; but at the close of his sermon told them, that should not be his constant way of preaching; for since Almighty God does not intend to lead men to heaven by hard questions, he would not therefore fill their heads with unnecessary notions; but that for their sakes his language and his expressions should be more plain and practical in his future sermons." As a man must avoid the appearance of evil, so he must avoid the appearance of imbecility. While his great aim should be to be understood, a subordinate end may be to impress his hearers with an idea of his claims upon their studious attention. The character of his hearers must determine the mode of accomplishing this design. When Dr. Pococke was Arabic lecturer at Oxford, his discourses to the university congregation were remarkably erudite, but afterward when he preached to his rustic audience at Chidry he dispensed with his classical quotations. But his people regarded Latin and Greek sentences as a badge of ministerial capability; and although their minister's fine sense commanded their homage, they yet felt compelled to say of him, "though a kind and neighborly man, he was no Latiner."\* We admire this Christian magnanimity in Dr. Pococke, and yet feel but little heart to blame the preacher who, being crafty to catch men, remembers that they will not always value him aright, until they know that he has made some attainment far above their comprehension. He should not forget the moral of the remark which the

\* A similar incident is recorded of a distinguished professor of theology and well-read metaphysician, preaching to a plain people in the interior of Pennsylvania, and so simplifying his thoughts, that one of his unlettered hearers "was much pleased with him, but guessed he was not a very learned man." Such simplicity is the truest mark of genius, but is one of those admirable qualities which are not always appreciated in such a world as this, and which, like pearls, need not be invariably cast before swine.

parishioner at Killmany made to secure the presence of his three friends at the kirk, "Come and hear my minister, for in ten minutes he will carry you where you will not know where you are." We are mortified at such an eulogium; we are still more surprised at the honorable mention which Aristotle makes of that style of writing which is designed not for instruction but for display, referring to the "display of eloquence," as one of the three kinds of oratory. Yet there is a wide distinction between a fondness for transcending our hearers' comprehension, and a willingness to comply at fit times with the conditions for receiving their merited regard. When we are instructing some advanced minds in our auditory, we may be comforted by the thought, that even the less intelligent minds may be receiving some new impressions of ministerial dignity; for "men frequently admire as eloquent, and often admire the most what they do not at all or do not fully comprehend, and are apt to think meanly of every thing that is brought down to the low level of their capacities."\*

Though no minister has a right to utter learned or unlearned nonsense, though no one has a right to surpass his hearers' comprehension except for a crying necessity, though vain men stumble at this stumbling stone, and vain men are never like angels' visits, though such an expedient is perilous, and allowable only for those who can resist its temptations, and seldom even for them, yet Richard Baxter says, "Preach to such (opinionated) auditors some higher points which shall be above their understandings. Feed them not always with milk, but sometimes with strong meat; for it exceedingly puffs them up with pride, when they hear nothing from ministers but what they already know, and can say themselves; this it is that makes them think themselves as wise as you, and as fit to be teachers; and it is this that hath set so many of them on preaching; for they believe that you know no more than you preach. However, do not neglect the great fundamentals of religion, nor wrong other persons for their sakes."†

In a dialogue on the subject of preaching, published in the reign of Charles II, one of the interlocutors proposes

\* Whateley's *Rhetoric*, part III, chap. 1, § 6.

† See Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, in *Young Preacher's Manual*, p. 313.

the following queries: "Will not this (plainness) disoblige the ministers from taking pains about (their sermons)? Would it not expose their preaching to the disrespect, if not contempt, of the people? Will they not think they can preach themselves, if it be so plain a business? And will not the ministerial office be rendered liable to be usurped by every one that judgeth he hath abilities for plain instruction?"\* If the preacher assume a mere equality with his people in the pulpit, will not they assume an entire equality with him out of the pulpit, and apply the familiar epithet, brother, to him who is their brother indeed, but also their teacher and father? Said a venerable divine of our own country, "When my people become self-sufficient, I give them a sermon which convinces them that they do not understand all things, and I now and then fire over the heads of some of them, to make them look up." While transcending the powers of some, he might, of course, be very instructive to others. Now if any man run wild with the fancy that he may employ a technically learned style often, or that he may ever employ it for the purpose of gratifying his vanity, he is the last man to employ it at all; for he shows that he mistakes his own genius and the sacredness of the pulpit. A hard word is like a medicine, which if administered frequently is hurtful, and the usefulness of it is in meeting an occasional want, and a proud man is sure to make himself ridiculous by his scholastic phrases. But it is not pride, it is the humility of a reasonable Christian, which aims to create a reverence for the pulpit as a preacher's throne, and for the preacher as a schoolmaster, revealing such things as the angels desire to look into. It is indeed a dangerous work,—but moral beings must do dangerous work sometimes,—for a preacher to magnify his office, when he thereby exalts his personal influence. Yet Richard Baxter says, "In order to preserve the church from infection, it is desirable that the minister be so far superior to the people, as to be able to teach them and keep them in awe, and manifest their weaknesses to themselves and others. The truth is (a truth which cannot be hid), it is much owing to the weakness of ministers,

---

\* See "A Seasonable Defence of Preaching and the Plain Way of it," p. 107. The proper answer to these questions is, that the *reasonably plain style* is in fact the most difficult and commanding of all styles.

that our poor people run into so many factions. When a proud seducer has a nimble tongue, and a minister is so dull or ignorant as to be confounded by him in company, it brings him into contempt, and overthrows the weak, who judge his to be the best cause that talks in the most confident, plausible and triumphant manner.”\*

Seventhly. The preacher should aim at that degree of plainness which will favor his own inward growth. Whatever augments his power benefits his people. And he represses his power, if he uniformly check the swift current of his thoughts through fear of outstripping the tardiest of his followers.† One of the surest signs of a wise man is his ability to use rather than be used by a general rule; and perhaps the intellectual character of the ministry has suffered as much from an indiscriminate compliance with the general rules relating to plainness, as from any single cause. An excellent writer says to clergymen, “Your expressions may be very common, without being low; yet employ the lowest, provided they are not ridiculous, rather than not be understood.” Now, by an exclusive deference to such a remark, some preachers may become very simple both in style and sense. Their minds are soon assimilated to their sermons, and their highest praise is that they are as low as the lowest of their auditors.‡ There is always danger that by his frequent commingling with uneducated men, and his belief in the impossibility of becoming too plain, the minister lose his literary tastes, and conclude to sell his books to supply

\* *Reformed Pastor*, in the *Young Preacher’s Manual*, p. 312.

† “A great mind,” says Dr. Channing, “cannot, without injurious constraint, shrink itself to the grasp of common passive readers.” He cannot do this *uniformly*. The remarks of Dr. Channing on perspicuity of style, in his *Review of Milton* (*Discourses*, pp. 21, 22), are liable to be misunderstood, as they overlook the *relative* character of perspicuity. He does not intend, as his *Edinburgh* reviewer supposes (see *Ed. Rev.*, vol. LXIX, pp. 112—121, Am. ed.), to justify a style, which is obscure to all, but only to some; a style, “dazzling to common readers, but kindling to congenial spirits,” spirits congenial with the author, a style as perspicuous as the whole and full idea will permit.

‡ The tendency of plain preaching to degenerate into easy talk is well illustrated by Hesse. Speaking of the German pulpit, he says, “We have modern sermons, on the physical education of children, upon attachment to old customs in the management of household affairs, upon carefulness in going about with fire and lights, upon attention to certain agricultural labors, even upon the baneful effects of coffee-drinking, etc., etc.” See Hesse, *Ueber Popularität*, etc., pp. 63—67.

the increasing deficiencies of his salary. His style of preaching demands no scholarship; and the supply is generally equal to the demand. He avoids the pride of letters, and the influence of them also. But there is a Scylla as well as Charybdis here. There is danger to the preacher's inward growth from the scholastic style of address. As it is easy to write common-place, so it is often easier to write in a learned style than in that which makes the results of learning transparent to the common mind. The preacher gains new acumen in the labor of extricating his conclusions from the processes by which he reached them. He lives in a different world from his hearers, his ideas are arranged on philosophical principles, he thinks in the language of the schools, and of course finds it difficult to invert his mind, and metamorphose himself into a man for the people. But this difficulty is what he needs. He derives good discipline from resisting it. Let him break up the wonted order of his associations, cast his discourses into a popular mould, as far and as often as sound judgment directs, and he increases his versatility and health of mind. To make great things appear plain, requires the clearest comprehension of them, and what it requires it gives. The whole subject must be canvassed, so as to determine what to omit as well as what to insert; so as not to say too little or too much. It was because Lord Mansfield expended so great labor upon the arrangement of his speeches, and summoned his whole genius to make the statement of his case, that Mr. Burke said of his mere statement, "it was of itself worth the argument of any other man." "He divested it," says Charles Butler, "of all unnecessary circumstances, brought together all that were of importance, placed them in so striking a point of view, and connected them by observations so powerful, but which appeared to arise so naturally from the facts themselves, that frequently the hearer was convinced before his lordship began to argue.\* Mr. Webster has said that the highest flattery he ever received for eloquence was the remark made to him by an unlettered hearer of a plea on a very intricate law case, "I liked *your* plea, for I understood every word of it." When, therefore, bishop Wilkins says, "the greatest learning is to be seen in the greatest plainness,"

---

\* Reminiscences, p. 107.

and bishop Usher, "it requires all our learning to make things plain;" they should be interpreted as demanding such a mixture of the severe and the simple, such a labor to clothe abstruse thought in transparent diction, that the preacher's mind shall be tasked in sharp analysis, that he shall arrange his ideas on a plan so rigidly logical, as to be easily seen through, and that he shall make Herculean effort "to bring the mountain to his hearers, since his hearers, unlike Mahomet, will not come themselves to the mountain."

Eightly. The preacher should aim at that degree of plainness which comports with the scriptural idea of the sacred office and the example of inspired men. The scriptural standard for this office is a high one. It points to the minister as a guide, but a guide must go *before* the multitude, or he cannot lead them; as a shepherd, but a shepherd must not make himself one with his sheep. It is not true, that every verse or chapter of the Bible is level to the lowest intellect, or that our Saviour "never spoke in a style which would be unintelligible to the great multitude."<sup>\*</sup> He avowed that unto some it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but unto those that were without, all these things were spoken in parables, "that seeing they might not perceive, and hearing they might not understand."<sup>†</sup> We read even of his elect disciples, "they understood not that saying, and it was hid from them, they perceived it not; and they feared to ask him of that saying."<sup>‡</sup> Sometimes he so taught the multitude that his disciples asked him privately what was the purport of his instructions,<sup>||</sup> and sometimes he so taught even his disciples that "they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising of the dead should mean."<sup>§</sup> He adopted a frequent method of conversing which did not at once transfer his own idea into the mind of his hearer; saying, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth," and they thought that he spoke of taking rest in sleep; "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and they

\* For an overdrawn description of the plainness of Christ's teaching, see Hesse, *Ueber Popularität und Simplicität im Predigen*, pp. 37, 38. Through the whole of this excellent volume there is a similar overstatement of the requisite degree of simplicity in sermons.

† Mark 4: 11, 12. Luke 8: 10.

‡ Luke 9: 45. See also Luke 18: 34. Mark 9: 32. John 8: 27. 12: 16.

|| Mark 4: 10. 7: 17. Luke 8: 9.

§ Mark 9: 10.

thought of the leaven of bread ; "destroy this temple, but he spoke of the temple of his body." It is said of his first recorded conversation with his relatives, "they understood not the saying which he spake unto them," "but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart."\* And even on some of the essentials of his doctrine, his most intimate companions did not unravel the web of his discourse, until the Comforter brought all things to their remembrance. His object seemed to be, in part at least, to excite their minds by dark speeches, to inflame their curiosity by giving them glimpses of light, to make them feel their ignorance, work their way out of the labyrinth, and find at last, through grace, that knowledge is sweet to him who has toiled for it. Many of his words fell like seeds upon the earth ; they lay hidden under the soil ; they were not quickened until they had died ; and on a sudden, at the descent of him who had once brooded over the waters, the seeds sprung up, and the fields were covered with plants which brought forth their fruit in its season. It is not pretended that the peculiar style of the Messiah's teaching is to be imitated in all respects by us. He was a being of peculiar glories ; came on a peculiar errand, "was set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel," and there were special reasons why he should veil himself in mysteries for trying the hearts of men. Still his example cannot fail of suggesting some exceptions to the rule that we should accommodate ourselves to the most imbecile of our hearers. As to the apostles' preaching, we are willing to concede with Hesse, that "we must distinguish between what was adapted to the popular comprehension in their day, and what is now adapted to it ; and we must not forget that many things might appear plain to the first hearers of the apostles and to the first readers of their writings, which now appear at first glance obscure, and would indeed be justly charged with obscurity, if they had been written for the present times."† Still we know, that the original readers of the Epistles sometimes failed of apprehending their import, and that there actually were in them "some things hard to be understood." And we cannot suppose that the Revelation of John and the prophecies of the Old Testament were accommodated to the infantile

---

\* Luke 2: 50, 51.

† Ueber Popularität und Simplicität, p. 39.

and listless intellect, or indeed to any intellect that was not on the alert with its deepest energies. Some of the reasons for elevating the style of the Bible above the most facile comprehension of men will apply to our sermons; others will not. It is always to be remembered, that writings to be read demand less transparency than words to be spoken. Yet whoever considers the character and design of the sacred volume, will at once infer the possibility of our having an occasional right to deviate from the highest or rather the lowest measure of plainness.\*

But the Bible is not a book of one idea. It is not all elevation, more than it is all simplicity; but is so dignified and so perspicuous, as to meet in the fittest manner the wants of all men. In this is it our model, that it blends seemingly discordant virtues. "In the New Testament," says Augustine, "there are shallows where the lamb may ford, and depths where the elephant may swim." The Bible comes to the child, and entertains him with its beauties. It comes to the philosopher, and he grasps after its full import, but is rebuffed, and makes a death struggle to comprehend it all, but sinks to the earth in his struggling. Now the style of the pulpit should make these apparently discrepant qualities coalesce. It should be like the lunar rainbow, as the gospel has been compared to the solar, commingling varied beauties into one group. There are two modes of effecting this combination. The first is, to write appropriately to the various classes of our hearers, sometimes for one class, sometimes for another; the second and often more acceptable mode is, to select

\* The following remarks of Pascal, in his *Thoughts on Religion*, may be contrasted with the exaggerated statements often made of the perspicuity of the Scriptures. "There is enough of light for those who wish only to see, and enough of obscurity for those who possess the opposite disposition. There is a sufficient degree of obscurity to blind the reprobate; and enough of clearness to condemn them and render them inexcusable. The design of God is rather to perfect the will than the understanding. But perfect clearness would only benefit the understanding, and would be an injury to the will. If there were no obscurity at all, man would not be sensible of his corruption. If there were no degree of light, man would have no hope of relief. All things turn out well for the elect, even the obscurities of Scripture; for they honor these on account of the divine splendors which they perceive there. And all things turn out ill for the reprobate, even the splendors of Scripture; for they blaspheme these on account of the obscurities which they do not understand."

that phraseology which combines the dignified with the simple. The scholar-like phrases, which would represent religion as an abstract science, are not to be the favorites of the preacher. The vulgar idiom, which would represent religion as an exile from reputable society, and a suppliant for favor at the cottage door, is not seemly for the common style of the pulpit. But there is a phraseology between the two; one which the majority can understand, and which no one will despise; this, though not the exclusive, is the ordinary, style for our sermons. There are technical terms which will be understood only by the few individuals familiar with the arts or sciences; there are provincial terms, intelligible only to the inhabitants of particular provinces; there are obsolete words, which are favorites only with the antiquary; but there are good old English words, understood and hallowed by all professions and in all our neighborhoods. The scholar understands amenity and entity, the ploughman not; but both understand pleasantness and being. The American apprehends the idea of *basing* an argument; many an Englishman would think an argument degraded by being based; but all know what it is to establish or found an argument. The Yorkshireman, and his countryman from Cornwall, can both understand the peer; but the peer understands them with difficulty, and they comprehend each other with still greater difficulty. "Though it may be very uncommon," says Dr. Campbell, "to speak or write good English, yet of all idioms subsisting among us, that to which we give the character of purity is the commonest;" and hence arises the truth of Dr. Kenrick's remark, that "the case of languages or rather speech (is) quite contrary to that of science; in the former, the ignorant understand the learned better than the learned do the ignorant; in the latter, it is otherwise." Now these pure, wholesome words, such as are almost sanctified by our translation of the Bible, are ordinarily the choice words of the preacher; for they are words of dignity, for they are words of plainness, for they are words which unite the seemingly incongruous qualities of the pulpit style. Though there may be so much plainness as to destroy the dignity of a discourse, and so much dignity as to destroy the plainness, yet a wise man may make a dignified theme appear the plainer, because it is dignified;

and a plain theme appear the more dignified, because it is plain. In the language of bishop Hurd, "to frame a discourse in this way, as it is [ordinarily] the usefulness way of preaching, so it will afford full scope and exercise for all the talents which the oldest of us may possess."

The rules which have now been given in reference to the proper standard of perspicuity, modify each other. No one of them should be followed, without reference to some at least of the others. They may appear mutually contradictory, apart from their mutual relation. Perhaps a good epitome of them all would be, that the sacred orator should adopt the style which will sooner or later affect the greatest amount of intellect and of moral susceptibility with the greatest amount of truth, and will meet according to their relative value all the sensibilities, both higher and lower, of all the minds addressed. That this standard has ever been attained by uninspired men, no one will affirm. Our best preachers, in their intended approximation to it, have sometimes deviated on the side of excessive obscurity, but have seldom adopted that *beboying* and *begirling* style (if we may coin such words) which has often been recommended. Even Wesley and Whitefield were far from always preaching for babes and sucklings.\* Indeed, our more illiterate preachers, who have attained a useful popularity, have sometimes been more prone than others to interlard their discourses with words of too learned length. The reformer of the British pulpit, whose enviable distinction it has been to sacrifice erudition to common sense, says, in conclusion of one of his sermons, "Though probably many things that I have said may not be within the full reach and comprehension of all capacities, yet because I hoped they might be useful and beneficial to some at least, I would not think the other consideration a sufficient reason why I should wholly omit them, and pass them by; remembering what St. Paul says, that he was 'a debtor to the wise,' as well as 'the unwise.' And St. Peter tells us that St. Paul, in his epistles, wrote many things hard to be understood by

\* It is related of Wesley, that on one occasion he addressed a collection of children for a quarter of an hour, in words of only one syllable. This, however, was a rare instance of folly.

some persons; yet, because these things might be of use to others, the Spirit of God did not think fit to omit the writing of them." \* We are far from defending the profuse Latinisms and Grecisms of Jeremy Taylor; yet even his sermons contain much that would interest and profit an ordinary congregation. We read on the title-page of his discourses, and in his dedication of them to lord Carrberry, that "they were preached at Golden Grove, to the family and domestics of his patron, or at most to a few gentlemen and ladies of that secluded neighborhood, and to as many of the peasantry on the estate as could understand English." Bishop Heber is "inclined to believe that, in preparing (these) sermons for the press, he materially changed them from the compositions which he had delivered to his rustic auditory in South Wales, or that they had really been, in the first instance, designed for the University pulpit, and that when preaching them at Golden Grove he had recourse to such extemporaneous omissions or alterations as suited the abilities and circumstances of his congregation." † We hope this may be proved something more than a plausible conjecture. We cannot believe, however, that the discourses were altered *materially*, or, indeed, that perspicuity would demand any *essential* change in their ground-form. The greater part of the sermons that have come down to us from his time are crowded with lore, though they were addressed to promiscuous assemblies. Very far would we be from recommending them for unrestrained imitation; but we appeal to them as the most influential sermons in our language, and as sanctioning any maxims of rhetoric sooner than those simple ones, by which "women bear rule over men, and make the toilette a tribunal, before which the most gigantic minds must plead." "It is my full conviction," says Coleridge, "that in any half-dozen sermons of Dr. Donne, or Jeremy Taylor, there are more thoughts, more facts and images, more excitements to inquiry and intellectual effort, than are presented to the congregations of the present day in as many churches or meetings during twice as many months. Yet both these

\* Archbishop Tillotson's Sermons, Vol. 12, Sermon 223.

† See Heber's Life of Bishop Taylor, p. 190.

were the most popular preachers of their times, were heard with enthusiasm by crowded and promiscuous audiences, and the effect produced by their eloquence was held in reverential and affectionate remembrance by many attendants on their ministry, who, like the pious Izaac Walton, were not themselves men of learning or education. In addition to this fact, think, likewise, on the large and numerous editions of massy, closely-printed folios, the impressions so large and the editions so numerous that all the industry of destruction for the last hundred years has but of late sufficed to make them rare. From the long list, select such works alone which we know to have been the most current and favorite works of their day; and of these again no more than may well be supposed to have had a place in the scantiest libraries, or perhaps with the Bible and Common Prayer Book to have formed the library of their owner. Yet on a single shelf so fitted we should find almost every possible question, that could interest or instruct a reader whose whole heart was in his religion, discussed with a command of intellect that seems to exhaust all the learning and logic, all the historical and moral relations of each several subject. The very length of the discourses with which these 'rich souls of wit and knowledge' fixed the eyes, ears and hearts of their crowded congregations, are [is] a source of wonder now-a-days, and (we add) of self-congratulation to many a sober Christian, who forgets with what delight he himself has listened to a two hours' harangue on a loan or tax, or at a trial of some remarkable cause or culprit. The transfer of interest makes and explains the whole difference. For though much may be fairly charged on the revolution in the mode of preaching as well as in the matter, since the fresh morning and fervent noon of the Reformation, when there was no need to visit the conventicles of fanaticism in order to

'See God's ambassador in the pulpit stand,  
Where they could take notes from his *look* and hand;  
And from his speaking action bear away  
More sermons than our preachers use to say;'

yet this must be referred to the same change in the habits of men's minds,—a change that involves both the shepherd

and the flock; though, like many other effects, it tends to reproduce and strengthen its own cause." \*

If Izaac Walton,—who kept a small draper's shop, seven feet and a half long and five wide, and afterward occupied but half of a shop, John Mason, hosier, having the other half,—if this simple-hearted man listened with such delight to the discourses of Richard Hooker and Dr. Sanderson, may we not hope that the tastes of our community can be so educated as to appreciate a higher standard of pulpit performance than now prevails? And did not some of the older ministers in our land actually adopt a higher standard? Our fathers were not seldom used to walk through snow and hail, of a cold winter's day, and sit down in an unwarmed church, and were delighted with long discourse on sovereignty, electing grace, foreknowledge absolute. The ministry of that day, we concede, went over the line sometimes, and beyond it. They often were too metaphysical. But is there not danger that we, in avoiding their extreme, may foster an effeminate taste among our people? Our architects have removed the old sounding-board from the meeting-house,—have lowered the pulpit, and have raised the pews. All this may be for good. But let it not be an omen that our ministers will dethrone sound doctrine from its supremacy, bury every principle under illustrations, become afraid of stern and strong thought, and choose to declaim their hearers to sleep by gentle and lullaby discourses. While we would rather speak five words with our understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue, we would yet so preach that our hearers shall inquire diligently into the things that are spoken, and shall search the Scriptures daily whether these things be so.

---

\* Coleridge's *Lay Sermons*, p. 185.

## ARTICLE II.

## HISTORICAL OUTLINES OF GERMAN RATIONALISM.

*Historical Sketch of the Revolution in Theology which commenced in 1750 in Germany.* From the German of Dr. A. THOLUCK. Translated by the Editor.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 269.]

*The progress of the new theology until the beginning of the nineteenth century.*

It might be supposed that, in representing the spread and fuller development of the doctrines broached by Semler, we should pass from him directly to those of his disciples who carried out and completed what he had begun. But, as has been already intimated, this distinguished man left behind him no disciples, in the proper sense of the term. He had no system to be more fully developed by others. He threw out upon the public mind innumerable sparks, but kindled no flame. A still further reason is to be found in the strange character of some of his views, especially the unnatural distinction, on which he laid so much stress, between public and private religion. Stroth, Griesbach and Corrodi have the best claim to being regarded as his disciples.

Instead, therefore, of tracing out external historical connections between Semler and his followers, we must seek for an internal development of neological principles. We shall pass over the department of church history as comparatively unimportant in this investigation, and confine our attention to the progress of Rationalism in exegetical and doctrinal theology. To this will be subjoined an account of the spread of neology in the different states of

---

NOTE. Some of our readers may have been surprised to learn that Frederic the Great should be so familiar with the *Shakers* as would appear from p. 259 of the June number. And yet we can assure them that the word *Schaeker* (*Cheker* is the Prussian monarch's French orthography) stands in the original. We must add, however, that it should have been translated *blackguard*.—ED.

Germany and in the universities. We can pursue these inquiries only into the first *decennium* of the nineteenth century, for in the second, new views, both of a negative and positive character, begin to appear, whose results cannot yet be estimated.

In portraying the revolution in exegetical theology, it will be necessary to commence with the changes which took place in the views of men in regard to the Scriptures. The mind, which is struck with the divine character of the Scriptures, which finds in its own sanctified religious consciousness a testimony in favor of their divinity, must of course regard the *medium* through which these divine truths are communicated as itself divine. For the divine truth contained in the Bible could not so seize the mind, could not find in the human breast such a testimony in its favor, were it not itself pure and unspotted, or in other words, were it not divinely communicated. Thus a belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures must have originated in the mind of the Christian, even had there been no declarations to that effect contained in them. In the *New Testament* there is no *direct* testimony to its own inspiration.

When men began to speculate upon the subject, it was supposed that there were things in the sacred writings which could not be traced to a divine causation, but which were rather to be attributed to human weakness or to accident; and that there was, on the other hand, much to which the Holy Spirit within us could not testify. Such opinions gave rise to a milder view of inspiration, according to which either verbal inspiration was given up, or a distinction was made between religious truths and the truths of science and history, in the former of which the possibility of error was denied, while in the latter it was admitted. Occasional hints of this kind, without being formed into a system, are to be found in the writings of the Christian Fathers, in Irenaeus, Origen, and Jerome, and especially in the writings of the Reformers, as Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Pellican and Beza. So also the rabbinical division of inspiration into three degrees is a modification of the more rigid abstract theory. The Catholic church has always taken a lower view of inspiration than the Protestant, maintaining, instead of a passive inspiration and suggestion, merely the assistance and guidance of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine that the Bible

was the only source of truth, led the Protestants, particularly the Lutherans, to entertain the most rigid views of inspiration. Thus originated the theory of an *absolutely passive* inspiration, as we find it in the writings of Calov, according to which the sacred writers "acted no part in these divine communications, except lending the instrumentality of the mouth and the hand." "The Scriptures," according to Quenstedt and Hollaz, "are free from every kind of error, even in matters of topography, philology and science, as their style is from all solecisms and barbarisms." Even as late as 1714 a general superintendent, Nitzsche of Gotha, thought it necessary to write a dissertation on the question, *whether the Bible is itself God*. This doctrine had its defenders till after the middle of the last century. Ernesti and Knapp defended verbal inspiration. So also Buchner in a dissertation written in 1760; and in another of 1769, he expressly maintains the inspiration of the Hebrew vowels and accents. There were, indeed, individual Protestants, as Calixt, Grotius and Clericus, who adopted and carried out the milder views of the ancient theologians above-mentioned; but they were censured by their church.

This was the period in which the tendency to natural religion was so strong. That which the reader brought with him to the Scriptures, he found in the Scriptures. The more they lost of their import, and the looser the view of revelation, the less was the concern for their sacred origin and their pure transmission. In this manner originated new and lax ideas respecting *inspiration* and *revelation*. Some may suppose that just the reverse is true,—that historical inquiries preceded and led the way to this change. But with Semler and his associates, the destructive historical criticism\* was not carried so far as to make the surrender of revelation necessary; and, besides, it can be demonstrated, that the shallow views of theology which have been described, preceded the destructive criticism.

The view of inspiration which Semler distinctly avowed goes directly to annihilate the distinction between the sacred writings and other productions. Only those books

\* This term is now generally employed to designate those critical labors of the Rationalists by which Christianity was undermined.—ED.

which serve "to mend men's morals," are, according to him, inspired; but as this quality is found in the works of pagans as well as Christians, we find this theologian of Halle maintaining that some of the heathen were also inspired. We have seen to how small a number he, under the guidance of this rule, reduced the books of the Scripture canon. By such views, the inspiration and canon of the Scriptures are reduced to a level with other books. In proportion as a book can lay claim to a moral character, it must be regarded as divine; and in proportion as the improvement of modern times produces clearer views of morals, the works containing them excel the Bible itself.

We see the consequences of Semler's doctrines pushed to this extreme by those theologians who went most directly over to the borders of *naturalism*. "What is the harm," says Eichhorn, "that in the New Testament, Christianity should have only its beginning and not its perfect form? Allow that its first teachers only began to enlighten the human mind in regard to its destiny, and to ennable the human heart by better principles, and that they attempted to eradicate only so many immoral and hurtful prejudices as their circumstances permitted:—is not the reformation of mankind rather the silent work of ages, than of a moment?" It soon came to that pitch, that in our first universities views respecting the Bible and its inspiration were openly and fearlessly promulgated, which about forty years before drew down upon J. E. Edelmann the censure of the theological world.

If, in the doctrine of inspiration, the Holy Spirit is set aside, it will, of course, not be supposed to be present in the influence which the Scriptures exert upon the mind. For it is only where the Spirit of God acts upon the mind of the writer, that it can be supposed to act also upon that of the reader. It is well known how *naive* Michaelis, that worm-eaten pillar on which the fabric of supernaturalism then rested, expressed himself respecting the "*testimony of the Holy Spirit.*" "I have, I honestly confess," says he, "experienced, during my whole life, no other testimony of the Holy Spirit in regard to the Scriptures, than that which is the evidence of their divinity,"—that is miracles.\*

---

\* A work on this subject, that is still worthy of consideration, is Spalding's "Thoughts on the Value of the Feelings," a book that was much read in its day, and that contributed not a little to give to

When the way was thus prepared, the biblical critic could come to the holy Scriptures regardless of any pre-supposed doctrines. But this boasted freedom from pre-suppositions is allowable only when the Bible is proved to be nothing but an ordinary book. There must be the pre-supposition either that the Scriptures are inspired, or that they are not. This kind of purely historical and candid criticism, as it is called, which retains no traces of a *theological* character, was first clearly exhibited in Eichhorn's Introductions to the Old and New Testaments, two works of the greatest importance in their day. It is not surprising, that criticism, when first feeling itself perfectly free from the shackles of ages, should overleap all bounds, and should utter its authoritative decisions, with a sovereign contempt of historical testimony. Still the power of eighteen hundred years' tradition was in some measure felt, and the criticism of Eichhorn was kept within certain limits. The most daring attempt in the higher criticism of the New Testament was the hypothesis of the lost original Gospel.

---

religion a colder as well as purer character. Against the error of the Pietists and the United Brethren, who with anxious solicitude were ever watching every change of feeling, and measuring their state of grace by the vividness of their emotions, he laid down two principles, first, that correct feelings always grow out of *known* truth, or that the right way is "from the head to the heart;" secondly, that the proof of a state of grace is increasing uprightness of character. To make certain supernatural influences upon the heart the criterion of piety is unsafe, because it is impossible for us to distinguish between supernatural divine influences upon us and those that are according to the course of nature; and it is furthermore quite unimportant which mode God adopts to excite in us right feelings. Just as these observations are, in a certain sense, they are nevertheless open to the objection, that they proceed from the material principle which separates God from his works, the consequence of which is that too little importance is attached to the feelings. The feelings, according to Spalding, are nothing but an *obscure notion* (*dunkle Vorstellung*); he even speaks of *enlightened* and *unenlightened emotions!* All these representations serve only to show what the feelings *are not*. The feelings are, in their positive character, the immediate modification of one's state of mind produced by another, so that this other, when thus related to me, is one with me, and is, in this sense, within me. From such a definition of feeling it follows, that all knowledge which does not also become a feeling, is merely *external*. Consequently, the uprightness of character and knowledge of God and of Christ required by Spalding, must *necessarily* have its seat in the feelings. Hence *feeling* is something essential to religion. But Spalding is right in requiring that one be able to give a just reason for his feeling, which shall at the same time be an adequate cause of its existence, and a proof of its legitimacy.

The venerable Gothic portal through which men passed in entering the mysterious edifice of the sacred oracles, was fallen; and the lowly hut of the Galilean fishermen needed only an ordinary entrance. If the Bible had no extraordinary character, it was to be explained like any other book. Since every ordinary writer is to be understood according to the times in which he wrote, and since, to an understanding of the New Testament writers a knowledge of the views of their Jewish contemporaries is not merely *an* important, but the *most* important exegetical aid; and as the writers of the New Testament and the hearers of Jesus were from the lower classes of society, "a clear apprehension of the ideas entertained at that time by the uneducated mass of the common people,"\* is the most important part of an interpreter's duties. There are, indeed, great minds, that rise above their age, and therefore cannot be understood from the views entertained by others around them, but must be directly penetrated by the reader in order to be comprehended. Yet it was not admitted, that an entirely new principle was introduced into the world by Christ and Paul and John; these persons were represented as only modifying the Jewish popular belief. Christianity was regarded as merely an aggregate of the better elements of Judaism. Even this view, in its deeper sense, is founded in truth; for Christ's agency was felt among God's covenant people, before the time of the Christian dispensation. He had, as the Scriptures say, spoken through the prophets. But these very elements of Judaism that were eternal, were overlooked, and the eye of the critic was directed chiefly to those views and ordinances which were of a pedagogical, and consequently of a temporary character. Besides this, the Jewish elements which were found in Christianity were viewed merely in an isolated state. The organic principle of Christianity, which united those elements into a whole and raised them to a higher elevation,—faith in the incarnation of Divinity which had *actually taken place*, and the redemption of the world,—was overlooked. Only "Jewish local ideas" were attached to the writings of the apostles, and this contracting, shrivelling process was called the *purely historical* method of interpretation.

---

\* Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, vol. IV, p. 333.

The New Testament was reduced to a mere account of opinions and events, in which the reader had no personal concern, but was like a clerk counting another's money. "The strongest proof," says Hegel, "that these doctrines have lost their importance is, that they are mostly treated *historically*, that they are represented as opinions entertained by *others*, that they are matters of *history*, which find no counterpart, no spiritual necessities, within *ourselves*."<sup>\*</sup> The old requisitions, that he who approaches the Scriptures, must do it with religious feelings because it is a religious book, is declared to be not only of *little*, but of *no* importance. This sentiment, which betrays an amazingly low opinion of Christ and of the Bible, was avowed by one whom we are accustomed to regard as a moderate Rationalist,—I mean Keil.

But there were some things in the Scriptures which would not accommodate themselves to the view, that there are no fruits there but such as human reason could produce from its own sandy soil. There were certain passages, which appeared to favor the old doctrines rather than the new, and there were prophecies and miracles in the way, rocks on which mere human reason was in danger of splitting. The newest mode of disposing of all such difficulties in a mass, by denying the authenticity of a book, was not then known. Hence nothing remained but the Herculean labor of applying the lever to every stone successively. No instruments were to be despised, not even those which had been worn out by the Socinians. Offensive passages were declared to be spurious, as the baptismal formula by Teller; or other readings were proposed, as in the beginning of the Gospel of John, by Bahrdt; or Socinian interpretations were given, as in John 8:58. 17:5. 10:30, by Semler and others. Other difficulties were disposed of by resorting to the theory of accommodation, as in the case of Christ's declarations respecting the devil, and a general judgment. Thus, by right or by might, what was objectionable in separate passages was removed. But there still remained one rock, that of *miracles*, which did not so easily yield. An attempt was made to sail around it, by representing miracles as a mere condescension to the Jewish love of the marvellous, useful, indeed

---

\* *Philosophy of Religion*, vol. I, p. 9.

in their day, but of no value at the present age. It soon appeared, however, that the method already resorted to in weakening the power of certain proof-texts, was not to be despised here. Only let a suitable regard be had to the language of the times, and mere *exegesis* will serve to remove miracles out of the way. A little *prose* is, indeed, requisite to render palatable the common-place matter that remains after every thing miraculous is subtracted. But of this there was no deficiency. Thus it was a subject of joy, when Eck showed that the songs of the heavenly host, mentioned in the second chapter of Luke, were nothing but the indistinct cries of an unknown Bethlehemite with a lantern! Hezel, Bahrdt, and others, accomplished for the Old Testament what Eck did for the New. Still some, particularly Bahrdt and Venturini, thought it necessary to season these tasteless narratives with a little sentimentality, and throw around them the air of Christian romance.

We have said, that the theology of this period controlled interpretation and criticism. The theology was of an abstract, speculative character; not seeking for *truth, as a treasure of the heart*, but for scientific accuracy and logical consistency. The fundamental law of this *formal* logic is that of identity and contrariety. "Each thing is like only to itself." Hereby a diversity or contrariety of tendencies, which are united in a concrete whole, is denied. What remains, though simple and easy of comprehension, is meagre enough. Had such speculating men directed their attention to *things*, instead of abstractions, and entered deeply into their nature, they would have perceived that there is contrariety in every thing that lives. Every thing that lives is progressive, and whatever is progressive, is the union of existence and non-existence.\* True freedom exists only where there is necessity, and true humanity only where there is a union with divinity.† This abstract way of viewing subjects could not admit of diversity; for in diversity one part appeared to contradict

\* Some of the ancient philosophers defined life to be a struggle between existence and non-existence; *i. e.*, one is constantly ceasing to be what he was, and striving to become what he is not.—ED.

† The meaning of the writer is, that man exists in his true dignity only when he lives according to his destination, which is that of a spiritual union with God.—ED.

and exclude the others. So in politics, different forms of government could not be tolerated, but freedom and equality were demanded for all, without distinction. In the different forms of religion, also, truth was conceived to be only that which was common to them all; and thus every thing was brought down to the level of a barren *natural* religion. *God, virtue, and immortality*, were the only residuum for the formation of a creed. The more the world of reality was removed from the individual, the more egotistically did he philosophize upon himself. The attention was wholly absorbed by psychological observations upon the *ego* and *non-ego*, and its associations of ideas in theory, and *eudemonism* in practice. Steinbart, in his Theory of Happiness, reduced morality to a *means* of happiness, and thus came out at the same point with the materialism of La Mettrie and Baron Holbach, who believed atheism contributed most to human happiness. That was the time when the venerable Spalding could write upon the *utility* of the ministerial office, and Adelung upon the *utility* of the perceptions (Spalding also speaks of *useful emotions*). It was no longer the question, what things are in themselves, or even what God is in himself, but how can man *profit* by these things. Such views are of English origin.

#### *The Gradual Diffusion of Neology.*

In commencing with Prussia, we are not influenced by any attachment to our native land, but are guided rather by the thread of history. The causes that made Prussia take the lead in corrupting theology, have already been mentioned. When Bahrdt was about to publish his Translation of the New Testament, he could, as he himself said, obtain certificates of approbation only from a *Prussian* faculty of theology, or at most from Göttingen, also. In all Protestant territories, except Prussia, the censors, till after 1780, prohibited the publication of books strongly tinctured with neology.

Among the theological faculties of Prussia, that of Halle was preëminent. Though since the middle of the last century none of the professors of theology there, except Semler and Baumgarten, had distinguished themselves in the propagation of neological views by their *writings*, still the number of their students greatly increased, and the

university gained a high *theological celebrity*, and sent out young men into almost every part of Germany. From 1777 to 1780, the number of *theological* students varied from 600 to 700; from 1781 to 1787, it varied from 700 to 800. From that period, the number began to decline. During the long ministry of Zedlitz (from 1772 to 1786), the neological professors, abovenamed, enjoyed unlimited freedom. Semler commenced his career as teacher of theology, in conjunction with Baumgarten, in 1752. In 1771, he was joined by J. G. Knapp, father of the celebrated theologian of the same name. To these were added, in 1764, Nösselt and Gruner, in 1766, J. L. Schulze, in 1772, A. Freylinghausen, in 1782, G. C. Knapp, and, in 1784, A. H. Niemeyer.\* Next after Semler, Gruner, a man of genius and great historical learning, was the most open and decided reformer of theology. Like Semler, he attempted to trace out historically the origin and various changes of the orthodox theology, differing from him, however, by making every body *Platonize* rather than *Judaize*. Nösselt, though his *writings* produced but little impression, had, by means of the multitude of students who were devotedly attached to him, great influence upon his times. Educated in the former pietism of Halle, and naturally modest and prudent, he yielded only by degrees to the new theology, and kept himself within certain limits. But so great was the change thus slowly and silently produced, that he was obliged to give up the project of issuing a fifth edition of his Defence of the Truth and Divinity of the Christian Religion, on account of the radical alterations which it would be necessary to make. He even went so far as to approve of the New Testament Commentary of Paulus, and the explanation of miracles by natural causes.

In nearly all the theologians of Halle, who were educated and rose to greatness under the influence of pietism which they afterwards renounced, we find delightful traces of a religious character. This was true, as has been seen, of Semler, and is equally so of Nösselt. The extracts which Niemeyer, in his biography, makes from his letters, show that he was deeply grieved by the growing

\* In all these instances, the date refers to the time of appointment as ordinary professors. Knapp was professor extraordinary as early as 1778, and Niemeyer in 1779.

impiety and immorality of his times; but, alas! the connection between cause and effect was overlooked. Marnezoll was so blinded as to attribute these effects to retaining too much of what was positive in Christianity and offensive to the taste of many noble minds. The serious character and respectability of Nösselt, together with his cautious procedure, contributed much to give currency to the neological sentiments which he taught.

In the preface to Knapp's Theology, Thilo, his son-in-law, labored to throw discredit upon Dr. Scheibel's account of his conversion from infidelity, in 1794, and showed from manuscript lectures of successive years that there was probably no great change in Dr. Knapp's faith during the time that he was professor of theology. His published letters, also, most of which, to be sure, were written since the beginning of the present century, breathe a pious spirit, and seem to indicate that such a spirit had for a long time been cherished. The younger Freylinghausen, and J. L. Schulze, directors of Francke's Institute, were true to their hereditary faith; but they were men of no energy, no depth of religious feeling. They smoked their pipes in peace, and gave no trouble to the adherents of the new theology.

We must not omit to mention in this connection the theologians of the Reformed [Calvinistic] church, which, from the year 1700, had a gymnasium with two theological professorships in Halle. In the second half of the eighteenth century, there were there J. Simonis, Mursinna and Stubenrauch, learned and able supporters of Rationalism. Mursinna, at least, whom Bahrdt called "the standard-bearer of the Reformed free corps," went hand in hand with Nösselt.

Beside the coadjutors which the Rationalists found in Eberhard, Trapp and Tieftrunk, of the philosophical faculty of the university of Halle, we must notice one theologian out of the faculty, who imposed himself upon these men as an associate, contrary to their will; we speak of Dr. Bahrdt. Driven from Leipsic (where he first appeared as a teacher of theology) on account of his profligacy, removed from office in Giessen on account of heterodoxy, hunted from Dürkheim [near Worms], where he was superintendent, partly by the government and partly by his creditors, this self-styled martyr of the truth

sought, in 1779, against the remonstrances of Semler, but with the approbation of his friend Teller and the minister Zedlitz, a refuge in Halle. This fugitive hero of modern illumination attributed it to a mean spirit of caste, that the theologians of Halle were indisposed to welcome him as an associate; but the real motive was, they did not wish their cause to be identified with his. The history, as given by himself, of his change of sentiments from the mystical orthodox theology of Crusius to the views of Semler, Eberhard and Trapp, shows the utmost levity of character. In conversation with Trapp, he happened to drop some expressions which implied faith in divine revelation. The former, not expecting such a weakness, exclaimed, "Ah! the enlightened Bahrdt believing in revelation? Büttner (then conversing with some others), hear that; Bahrdt is still a believer." "That," says the latter, "was the funeral knell of my faith." He was not admitted into the theological faculty, but was allowed to lecture on eloquence and moral philosophy. In the latter he was already known as a popular writer, though his ethical views allowed him to sell his manuscript to two booksellers at the same time,—a philosophy in which he continued to make improvements, for he afterwards sold his autobiography to not less than four. He possessed taste, imagination, wit and literary tact, and drew crowds to hear his lectures on ethics. Those who heard him assure us that his eloquence was surprising; and that he kept his audience alternately laughing and weeping. He even went so far as to hold lectures on the Sabbath before a promiscuous assembly of males and females, students, citizens and officers of the army, but was soon checked by the government. Dr. Bahrdt hereby became a very public person, and could, moreover, be seen, at any time, at the coffee-houses and inns. At length, to gratify his taste, as well as his love of gain, he opened a coffee-house of his own, which became the resort of his favorites. Here, without any reserve, a waiting-maid took the place which belonged to the wife. It is easy to see what a corrupting influence such a man would exert upon young theologians, and upon society in general. We pass over his two years' imprisonment in the castle at Magdeburg, for his anonymous invectives against Wöllner, who issued the celebrated edict for the suppression of irreligious books.

Nor can we here detail the history of the German Union, a secret society, formed by Bahrdt, for vile and selfish purposes, into which many distinguished men, all over Germany, were drawn, and to which they were committed before they knew its real character. The moral condition of the theological students at Halle at that time was degraded beyond conception. Of this, the most revolting proofs are to be found in the miserable Laukhard's autobiography. There we learn that in the year 1782, among the students who resided in Dr. Semler's house, the custom existed of appearing in *puris naturalibus*. We would gladly pass over all such details, were it not that they illustrate the state of things better than many pages of general description.\*

The death of the unhappy Bahrdt corresponded with his life. He died in the most frightful manner, of the syphilitic disease.

We turn from this revolting picture, and direct our attention next to the university of Frankfort on the Oder, which emulated Halle in its zeal for the new illumination.

Here, by the side of several professors of little notoriety, such as Stosch, E. A. Schulze, and Causse, two disciples of Baumgarten particularly distinguished themselves, and had great sway over the public sentiment during the second half of the last century. These were Töllner, Lutheran professor in 1756, and Steinbart, his successor from the year 1774 to the commencement of the present century. The above-mentioned professors of less distinction were probably attached to the old system; but they were tolerant towards the supporters of the new. They belonged to that class of theologians which Döderlein properly designates as negatively neological,—those who sit and look quietly on, while the thief comes and carries off one article after another from the house.

Töllner surrendered only by degrees his hereditary

---

\* It is affecting to read, in one of Knapp's letters, that, in answer to his prayers for students, that they might become pious, at length *one* such was granted him. "Such an event," to use his own words, "might encourage a man to ask for more than one, but in this my desires have not been answered, and now it remains for me to pray for the preservation of this one." What a spectacle! a rude multitude of about 700 theological students, indifferent to every thing that is sacred, and over against all these a professor in his closet praying for at least *one*.

faith, and even then kept back more of his real belief than he made known. In his two works, "Reasons why God did not accompany Divine Revelation with clearer Demonstrations," 1764, and "Proof that God leads Men to Salvation by the Revelations of Nature," 1766, he attacked the current views of the times, and questioned the *demonstrative* character of the arguments on which men had been accustomed to rely for the authority of divine revelation. "Dr. Steinbart," says the Almanac of the Church and of the Heretics, "*moves entirely within the clear light of the sun.* Few theologians in Germany have ventured to say what he has said, have spoken out with such freedom, or demolished the idol of the ecclesiastical system so completely as he has done. All his predecessors have contented themselves with assailing a few errors in detail, and with such reserve as never to exhibit their own system at large. This man has not only demolished the old structure, but has erected a new palace in its place."

In the university of *Königsberg*, the orthodox theology sustained itself till near the commencement of the present century. The most distinguished of its theologians, during the latter half of the eighteenth century, were warm supporters of a biblical faith partially tintured with the Halle pietism. Of this class, especially, was the pious Rogall (professor in 1732), a zealous disciple of the school of Halle. The learned Bock, who wrote against the Socinians and the Rationalists, was professor there from 1753 till his death, in 1786. Associated with him were Kypke, from 1755 to 1779, an exegetical scholar, educated in Halle; Riccard, who had studied in Klosterbergen\* and Halle; and, from 1751 to 1782, the pious Lilienthal, the teacher of Herder. Towards the end of the century, men of other views were introduced, such as Hasse, in 1788, Rinck, in 1800, and Vater [afterwards in Halle], in 1809.

Of the universities of Greifswalde and Breslau, we have no occasion here to speak, as the latter did not exist till the transfer of the Frankfort university to this place [in 1811], and as the former belonged at that time to Sweden. From the character of Prof. G. Schlegel, and from the

---

\* A celebrated gymnasium, near Magdeburg, now extinct.—ED.

periodicals of that time, we may infer that orthodoxy maintained itself in Greifswalde for a long time. The university of Duisburg deserves to be mentioned among the Prussian universities, on account of its able theological faculty, to which Berg and Grimm, and, afterwards, F. A. Krumacher, belonged. Berg was orthodox, Grimm was a Rationalist, and Krumacher leaned to Rationalism, though his parables are full of genius.

But the university of the greatest influence, not only upon Prussia, but upon all Germany, was that of the Prussian capital, Berlin. A Berlin theologian and an infidel were not infrequently regarded as synonymous terms. The spirit of the age during the last twenty years of the eighteenth century was the most fully represented by the Berlin school. Berlin, more particularly through the agency of the omnipotent *Algemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* (Universal German Gazette) gave laws to all Germany, not only in theology, but in philosophy, science and art. The very union of theology with the fine arts and with philosophy, made the Berlin theology the goal of the ambitious student. Süssmilch and Silbenschlag were, indeed, decidedly pious, as well as learned men. Reinbeck, A. F. W. Sack, and Büsching were yielding, while Teller, and Spalding, and Dietrich went hand and hand with Semler.

Next in order after the Prussian universities, the university of Göttingen claims our attention. Though the *curators* of this university were almost fastidiously orthodox during the last fifty years of the eighteenth century, still it had an important agency in the spread of Rationalism. Its theological faculty was second in renown only to that of Halle. Immediately on its establishment, in 1734, it had eminent theological teachers in Oporin, Kort Holt and Heumann, and soon after in Mosheim (in 1747), Michaelis and Heilmann, and finally in C. W. F. Walch, Peter Miller, Zachariä, and Koppe, all of whom kept up some appearance of orthodoxy, except, perhaps, Koppe. But such an orthodoxy, more especially as exhibited by J. D. Michaelis, was directly preparatory to Rationalism. He is one of the few educated at Halle, whose personal character manifested no traces of a pious education. A boundless egotism seems to have swallowed up his nobler feelings. He may have been sincere in defending the

scanty remains of orthodoxy, but the soul of religion he was willing to surrender to the Philistines, if he might but retain the skin. Hence the opposition to him by men who valued spirit,—by Lessing, Herder and Haman. Even his printed works are of doubtful moral tendency, and those who attended his lectures testify that these were decidedly hostile to piety. In this school was Eichhorn trained, who, as might be expected, stripped the natural theology of Michaelis of its unbecoming supernatural dress, and presented it naked to the public eye. There is this difference between the neology of Semler, Nösselt, Niemeyer, &c., and that of Eichhorn, Henke, Bauer, &c., that in the former there was an interest felt in religion and in the church, whereas the latter were concerned only for learning.

Next in order after Göttingen, the three universities of *Helmstädt*, *Erlangen* and *Jena* contributed most to the cause of Rationalism. Helmstädt had, indeed, among its theologians, during the long period from 1749 to 1803, one of the most faithful supporters of the old doctrines, in *John Benedict Carpzov*, a man of uncommon learning and literary activity, who delivered lectures in elegant Latin, in all the departments of theology. Here, also, was the celebrated polemic, *J. C. Schubert*. From the year 1761 to 1769, *Teller* [subsequently in Berlin], while undergoing a change in his theological views, acted powerfully upon the public mind in favor of Rationalism; and from 1778 to 1809, the new theology had in *Henke* one of its ablest and most decided supporters. In church history, he uniformly appears as the enemy of a spiritual religion, and in his other works he censures the church for idolizing Christ and the Bible. The effects of his influence are to be seen in the present state of theology and religion in the territory of Brunswick. His views were supported by *Pott* and *Sextroh*.

In *Jena*, until recent times, were to be seen the remains of a mild orthodoxy, which was formed in the latter part of the last century. *Kocher*, from 1751 to 1772, defended the creed and the authority of divine revelation. He was succeeded by *Danov*, who was educated partly at Helmstädt, under *Teller* and *Carpzov*, and partly at Göttingen, under *Michaelis* and *Walch*, and who was supposed to be more orthodox outwardly than he was at heart. It was

said of him that his outer garment was like that of the *regulars*, but that under it was the uniform of the *free corps*. On his death, Döderlein was called from Altdorf to fill his place. He was a man of acute discernment, profound erudition, and earnest religious character, though he yielded more than his predecessors to the critical rules of the new theology. "The liberal theologians," it is said, in the Almanac above-mentioned, "hoped to gain him as a recruit; they manœuvred around him, and sometimes drank his health, but could not confide in him, being unable to sound his views." Griesbach was his associate from 1775 to 1812. He manifested more interest in learning than in theology, though he appears to have maintained his attachment to the orthodox biblical theology. Schott, his successor, may be regarded as belonging to the same school. But along with this moderate supernaturalism, there was a decided neological influence exerted by Eichhorn from 1775 till his removal to Göttingen in 1788, by Paulus [now in Heidelberg], Gabler and Augusti [the latter now in Bonn]. About the close of the last century, Jena was the seat of the new German philosophy, and numbered Fichte and Schelling among its professors.

The university of *Altdorf*, near Nurenburg, and that of *Erlangen* had, at the commencement of the present century, distinguished professors of the new school. In Erlangen, there was, from 1770 to 1807, one theologian thoroughly orthodox, who was for that reason almost universally abhorred. This was the venerable G. F. Seiler. But the elder Rosenmüller, from 1773 to 1783, and Rau, were preparing the way for the change, which Hufnagel, Bertholdt, from 1806 to 1822, and Ammon, from 1772 to 1794, and, after his return from Göttingen, from 1804 to 1813 [afterwards in Dresden], completed. Altdorf numbered among its distinguished men successively Döderlein, Gabler, Bauer and Martini.

In *Kiel*, the theological faculty, even while neology was making its inroads upon other universities, maintained the milder form of orthodoxy which was common in those times. This remark is particularly applicable to Kleuker, but less so to A. Cramer, a man of unbounded popularity and of unquestionable ability. The latter was professor here from 1774 to 1784, and occupied nearly the same

doctrinal position that Knapp did in Halle. Still more yielding were Velthusen (afterwards in Helmstädt), D. G. Moldenhauer and Zachariä. But the most extensive and decidedly neological influence was exerted by Eckermann, a disciple of J. D. Michaelis. He continued here from 1782 to 1837, and outlived the school of theology to which he belonged. Henry Müller labored in a more daring manner, and Thiess, with learned diligence, to advance the cause of Rationalism.

Among the three Hessian universities, *Marburg*, *Rinteln* and *Giessen*, the last was soonest under the influence of Rationalism. Benner was a staunch supporter of the old school, and a powerful opponent of the Herrnhuters. His associates, Bechtold in theology, Ouvrier in church history, and J. C. F. Schulz, a disciple of Michaelis, in exegesis, were cautiously managing the change from the old to the new doctrines, while Bahrdt and Hezel (as a speculator, alike unsuccessful in authorship and in trade) openly avowed their neological sentiments. Their disciple, Leun, and Hezel's successor, Pfannkucke, a pupil of Eichhorn, carried on the work in the same spirit. A more enduring fame was earned by J. E. C. Schmidt, the learned ecclesiastical historian. He belonged to the critical school of Rationalists.

*Marburg* had, in the latter half of the last century, a rigidly orthodox and Calvinistic theological faculty in Endemann, Coing and Wytttenbach [father of the philologist]. The first strong impulse to Rationalism appears to have been given by K. W. Robert, who was supported by L. J. K. Justi, a disciple of Meiners and Michaelis, and, after Pfeiffer's death, by Münscher, who in fame eclipsed all his associates. Here Wachler, the historian, was, from 1802 to 1815, professor of theology, and, about the same time, Melchior Hartmann, K. W. Justi, J. L. Zimmermann, and the moderately orthodox Arnoldi. The university of *Rinteln* has never been very distinguished. Hassencamp, Wachler, the historian (from 1794 to 1801 professor of theology here), and Wegscheider (from 1806 to the extinction of the university in 1809, when he was transferred to Halle), were all Rationalists.

In Mecklenburg, at the commencement of the second half of the last century, orthodoxy was strongly fortified. The university of *Bützow* was supplied mostly with

professors educated in the Pietistic school of Halle. Such were Zachariä (afterwards in Göttingen), Mauriti, the celebrated Tychsen, and J. P. Müller. *Rostock* after the university of Bützow was united with it, rose to high renown. Here Tychsen, the orientalist, shone as a star of the first magnitude, though the pious sentiments which he imbibed at Halle, were well nigh buried under his self-complacency and pedantry. Martini, the learned historian, retained his orthodoxy, though not without some modifications. The grossest Rationalism was taught from 1792 to 1809 by Ziegler [Wiggers's predecessor], and from 1798 to 1823 by S. G. Lange.

In *Heidelberg*, in the latter half of the last century, Heddäus and Bütinghausen were standard-bearers of a strictly Calvinistic orthodoxy. Mieg and Wundt introduced a milder supernaturalism. During the long period of Catholic influence, when the Jesuits possessed most of the chairs of theology, the study of theology itself languished. On the death of Charles Theodore, elector of the Bavarian Palatinate, a part of the territory with Heidelberg came under a Protestant government again. In 1803, soon after the accession of Charles Frederic, the university was restored, the Catholic faculty transferred to Freyburg, and men of distinction placed in the Protestant faculty at Heidelberg. Some of these were Rationalists, and others were representatives of a new school of philosophical orthodoxy. They were Bauer, the daring author of the "Biblical Mythology," [the pious] Schwartz, since 1804, Daub, since 1805 [both recently deceased], Marheineke and De Wette, since 1807 [the former now in Berlin, the latter for a time in Berlin and now in Bâsle], Paulus and Abegg.

Thus we have pretty nearly taken the circle of the German universities, and found in them all substantially the same phenomenon. About the middle of the second half of the last century, men were every where found who were willing to be the tools of public sentiment. And could not this public sentiment be directed? Not without enlightened piety in the civil magistrates(?) and in at least some of the more distinguished theologians of the times, who should have the power to stem the swelling flood. In two Protestant states, in the Electorate of Saxony and in Württemberg there was, on the part of the magistrates, a dispo-

sition to stay the tide of public opinion. The same was true of Prussia during Wöllner's ministry. His attempt failed, for want of *enlightened* piety.\* He issued decrees demanding orthodox doctrines from those who were destitute of the orthodox faith. Rationalism was to be subdued by judicial proceedings, instead of being overcome by the weapons of science. Its adherents were indeed not persecuted, but they were silenced. But the common people distrusted the motives of the cabinet, and the learned the ability of the court to decide on such questions. Consequently this undertaking passed away without effect.

In the Electorate [now the kingdom] of Saxony it was otherwise. Here the faith of the church was still preserved in the universities of Wittenberg† and Leipsic, and was anxiously watched over by the government. Even the Wolfian philosophy, though not directly hostile to the old theology, was repressed. In what manner the orthodoxy of the church during this period passed through the school of a pliant supernaturalism into that of the vulgar Rationalism, may be seen in the history of three generations of theologians at Leipsic. The learned but singular Burscher stood boldly forth here from 1768 to 1805, as the champion of orthodoxy. With equal zeal did the excellent though undervalued C. A. Crusius (from 1750 to 1775) maintain the truth. He was at the same time the friend of practical religion and of philosophy. The elder Bahrdt (from 1755 to 1775) was also a faithful adherent to the old doctrines, though, according to his son's biography of him, he must have been a feeble light of the church. The celebrated Ernesti (from 1759 to 1781) must also be classed here, notwithstanding his laxity and his mildness towards those who were undermining the Christian faith. He prepared the way for the second stage of the change in theology, and formed the transition to the laxer supernaturalism of Morus, Dathe and J. G. Rosenmüller. The use made of the influence of these four last mentioned theologians by the Rationalists may be learned from the *Ketzer-Almanach* (Almanac of Heretics). Of Ernesti it

---

\* Wöllner was a Halle Pietist, and was educated a theologian. His abhorrence of the example of Zedlitz his predecessor, led him to the opposite extreme.—ED.

† Wittenberg, which formerly belonged to Saxony, now belongs to Prussia, and the university was in 1817 united with that of Halle.—ED.

says; "His inclination towards the liberal theology is inferred by his friends, from his sparing occasionally in his *Bibliotheca*, an insipid theologian, commanding his writings and protecting him from reproach." Of Morus it speaks thus; "The liberals are very complaisant to this learned man, and would gladly have him for their leader. Will he be persuaded by them? I think not." Of Dathe it is said; "The liberal theologians are kindly disposed towards him, because he never came out against them." To the third generation of Leipsic theologians, formed under the influence of this second, belong Keil (from 1793 to 1818), and Tzschrirner from 1809 to 1828.

Still longer did orthodoxy maintain its existence in Wittenberg. We may name Dresden from 1772 to 1805, and E. F. Wernsdorf from 1756, as its decided friends. A more pliant supernaturalism was introduced by K. C. Tittmann (from 1775 to 1789). Schröckh (from 1775 to 1808) and Reinhard (from 1780 to 1792, afterwards in Dresden till his death in 1812) occupied the same position in theology. With K. L. Nitzsch the Kantian philosophy entered Wittenberg, but under orthodox colors. Rationalism, properly speaking, first found admission there under Tzschrirner (from 1805 to 1809; afterwards he was removed to Leipsic); not, however, without great moderation and caution. In the meantime orthodoxy found another warm friend in Heubner; and from 1809, also in Schott.

There remains to be noticed one more university whose theological faculty has entered with spirit into the movements of each successive period, and has not escaped without some modifications of its supernaturalism, and yet not one of its teachers has been a supporter of the historico-critical Rationalism! This is Tübingen. Among its theologians at the beginning and middle of the second half of the last century, viz., Sartorius, Uhland, Hegelmaier, Märklin, Cotta, Rössler (Schnurrer), there was not one, so far as we know, except perhaps Rössler, who did not belong to the orthodox party, in the sense of the word as used at that time. They were men who were attached to the creeds, and who felt a sufficient interest in them to comment on the old theologians, as Cotta in his admirable edition of Gerhard's *Loci*, and to defend the Lutheran doctrines against the Reformed church, and to attack the idol of toleration, as Hegelmaier in his work on

the subject. By means of the theological *seminarium* [a society or class of select students for higher culture], connected as it is there with the office of the *Repetents* [subordinate teachers for reviewing the studies under the charge of the professors], this university has a theological influence upon its students rarely to be witnessed elsewhere. This is probably a chief reason why the university teachers produce such effect upon the clergy of Wirtemberg. When we consider that the vacant professorships are supplied from the number of native students educated there, we can easily understand why there should be a kind of theological tradition in Wirtemberg, which has clung to the old orthodoxy even through the whole period of neology. On the other hand, the young Suabian theologians are kept in connection with the spirit which prevails in other German states, by their course of study in philosophy, which precedes that of theology. Thus the Wolfian, and still more the Kantian philosophy, had their day in Tübingen. Probably no university, at the commencement of the present century, had so many theologians, who were initiated into the Kantian philosophy, as this. And yet they retained great freedom of spirit, opposing or favoring different parties, according to their independent judgment. The celebrated men of this period are Storr, made ordinary professor in 1786, J. F. Flatt in 1798, K. C. Flatt in 1803, Süskind in 1804, and E. S. Bengel professor extraordinary in 1806. The last leaned to the *historical* results of Rationalism. With the excellent Steudel, the last vigorous shoot of supernaturalism, as maintained by the pious and learned Storr, has become extinct. But as the lamented Steudel entered somewhat into the new mode of theological science [the *new evangelical school*], in which his associates joined him, this theological faculty has been able to keep up an unbroken succession of teachers of evangelical truth.

We have thus seen the gradual change from church orthodoxy to unbelief. The change from this state to that of a faith won by a new examination of all the grounds of doubt, must be reserved for future examination, as it is now but a matter of hope and anticipation.

## ARTICLE III.

## MENZEL'S GERMAN LITERATURE.

*German Literature.* Translated from the German of WOLFGANG MENZEL. By C. C. FELTON. In three vols., 12mo. pp. 352, 428, 372. Boston. Hilliard, Gray & Company. 1840.

WOLFGANG MENZEL is a very peculiar man; and no one who is acquainted with the character of his extraordinary mind, will expect to meet in the review, which we now propose to ourselves, unqualified praise or blame. The work before us was published in 1828, when the author was thirty years of age; a second enlarged edition appeared in 1836. It is impossible to understand the design and character of this production, without some knowledge of Menzel's literary history. He was born in Silesia in 1798. He pursued the studies of the gymnasium at Breslau, and those of the university at Jena and Bonn, and then became a teacher in Aarau, in Switzerland. His first production was his "Streckverse" or blank verses, which created considerable sensation. The next year, 1824, he edited the "Europäischen Blätter," or European paper, at Zurich, in which he commenced that literary warfare to which his whole life has since been devoted. He became the leader of the exclusive admirers of Schiller, who were very numerous in the south of Germany, and, at the same time, arrayed himself against the admirers of Göthe, and the critical school of Schlegel. Next appeared the first edition of his "History of the Germans," where he also acts the part of a reformer; at least in the edition of 1837, the only one we have examined, his tone is that of a polemic. In 1825, while at Heidelberg, he took part in the controversy between Voss and Creuzer, and became the mortal enemy of the former. From this period his residence was Stuttgart, where he formed a literary connection with Cotta, the celebrated bookseller, and soon after married into the family of Bilfinger, the philosopher. Here he prepared the first edition of his "German Literature," which made

him more extensively known as a writer of vast resources. But the tone of unsparing severity there manifested towards all the parties and individuals to whom he was opposed, called forth a host of assailants, who to this day have kept up the contest with much warmth, and of whom Strauss, his full match in controversy, gave him the last and most terrible cannonade in his "Streitschriften." In 1829, Menzel became chief editor of the "Literaturblatt," or Literary Journal, for which he had long written, and of which he had, in fact, been the anonymous editor, from the time that Müllner retired from it. This journal he now made his engine of war, and with it he fought out the battles of which his "German Literature" was the immediate occasion. Says a writer in the "Conversations-Lexicon of the Most Recent Times and Literature," whom we have chosen to follow in this sketch, "War is his element. He continues it with unwearied ardor, regardless of the reputation and number of his opponents, and of the ever-increasing hostility he meets with. We may apply to this deadly foe of all literary aristocracies what Livy says of Cato, the champion of democracy in Rome: *"Simultates nimio plures et exercuerunt eum et ipse exercuit eas. Nec facile dixeris, utrum magis presserit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem."*" Without particularly mentioning his poetical productions, and various occasional writings, we will here only add, that his political passion, which always predominated in his writings, has of late years been gratified; and that his public career since he entered the Chamber of Deputies has involved him more and more in political discussions.

In speaking of the merits of the work now under consideration, while we shall cordially admit the high excellences that are generally attributed to it, we shall have occasion to point out more defects than most of our countrymen, so far as we have had the means of information, appear to discover in it.

We shall venture to characterize Menzel as a man of undoubted genius, though infinitely inferior to Göthe, whom he affects to despise, and as a scholar of the most extensive and various acquisitions, but, in no small degree, deficient both in the impartiality of a faithful historian and critic, and in the dignity of a true philosopher. He is, notwithstanding his general greatness and strength,

sometimes exceedingly small and weak, and his pages are too often stained with the language of vulgar abuse.

The title of the work, by creating the expectation that the author will confine himself to the subject of literature, is adapted to mislead. A more general title,—“The Germans,” for example,—would better indicate the contents of the book; for it discusses the national character and institutions of the Germans quite as much as it does their literature. Still the author would be found stretching beyond his limits, for he has incorporated innumerable essays on subjects remotely connected with his professed object. What concern have we, for example, in the author's long disquisition on the liberty of the press,\* in his fine spun psychological theory of religion,† his views of the Catholic church,‡ his hatred of all the men and books that treat of the civil law,§ his notions of commerce,|| and a “whole forest” of other subjects, of which time would fail us to speak? Had he merely touched upon these as collateral topics, or thrown out remarks hinting at the principles by which he tested the merits of the works under review, he would only have been acting the part of a philosophical critic. But, as it is, he betrays, in innumerable instances, more interest in establishing and inculcating his own doctrines, than in illustrating the character and position of the writers with whom he was more properly concerned. His everlasting patriotism, and the party feelings growing out of his literary disputes, are perpetually obtruded upon us, where we should much prefer facts. We speak not now of the justness of his views on any of these topics, but of their pertinency. Is there any subject in the whole encyclopedia of human knowledge, or any interest connected with the well-being of society, that might not be discussed in such a work with equal propriety?

Of the first chapter of the “German Literature,” in which the author treats of the “quantity of the literature,” we have little to say, except that it is half historic verity and half comedy. After breaking the silence with the words: “The Germans do little, but they write so much the more,”—words which, in their spirit and style, are

\* Vol. I, pp. 84 and following.      † 96—110.      ‡ 133—138.

§ Vol. II, pp. 127—139.      || 239—243.

ominous of the character of all that is to come after,—he adds a little further on; “The pen governs and serves, works and pays, fights and feeds, prospers and punishes.” “The physician writes his receipt, the judge his sentence, the preacher his sermon, the teacher as well as the scholar, his task from books.” “Is any thing done, the most important consequence is, that somebody writes about it.” “We receive into ourselves all earlier culture only to enshroud it again in paper. We pay for the books which we read, with those which we write.” “See here the Low Dutch cattle-price of our religious literature,—whole walls, entire halls, full of priestly merchandise, gingerbread for souls.” These few single sentences will suffice to illustrate the author’s taste, and style of workmanship. His peculiar manner, however, is to be regarded not so much in the light of a labored effort of actual transgression, as in that of the natural consequence of a deeply-rooted original sin. He has a plethora of animal spirits; his imagination is like a playful child at church, almost bursting with tricks of frolic even when striving to be grave.

The next chapter relates to scholastic learning, and gives a tolerably good view of the subject, and a still better one of the author’s abhorrence of a university. “Even now,” he observes, “priests control theology, and official faculties, like guilds, domineer over the secular sciences.” We should like to be informed by what means any persons in the nineteenth century can contrive to “domineer over the secular sciences.” We had supposed that, in science, at least, the right of free inquiry and the liberty of speech were enjoyed alike in the university and out of it. Nothing but the stronger reason can domineer in science, and without the former a university professor can no more control the latter, than a poet laureate can the muses. “Even now,” he continues, “the greater part of our scholars and writers live like Troglodytes in their book-holes. Whether the slater has fallen from the roof, or Napoleon from his throne, they say, ‘Ah! ah! indeed! indeed!’ and thrust their noses again into their books.” Yes, Heeren and Niebuhr, and Von Raumer, and hundreds of other “world-renowned” German writers, “thrust their noses into their books;” and yet, like the magician of the south, the philosopher of Stutgard, they have contributed their quota to the great cause of human improvement.

Furthermore, he says; "We scarcely see a theologian or jurist,—only theological and juridical philologists. All the historical sciences have become unpalatable through philological and critical learning." Menzel's History of the Germans is less "critical" than Ranke's; is it therefore more "palatable"? Has history in Germany *become* more unpalatable than it was formerly? Is it not notorious, that the literary taste of Germany is at this moment historical beyond all former example; and that the recent historical productions of that country are now more palatable to the whole civilized world than those of any other nation, precisely for the reason that they are more critical? As to jurists, we might from the single universities of Göttingen and Berlin, name those, and not a few, who would bear comparison with the brightest ornaments of the profession in any other nation in modern Europe. If the author referred to sound orthodox doctrine in the theologians of the present age as contrasted with those of other times, we should feel constrained to agree with him. But this is not his meaning. He means to assert, that systematic theology, as a science, has been well nigh rooted up, and driven from its place by the philological deluge; and in this view we cannot concur. For we have before our eyes a few modern German works, which do not betray an utter want of ability to go beyond mere words and phrases, and to penetrate somewhat into the spirit of theological subjects. We suppose that Schleiermacher, De Wette, Twesten, Bretschneider, Hase, Nitzsch, and others that we might name, are known to some of the readers of this journal, and to a few beyond the limits of its circulation, as having given good proof of theological attainments above mere verbal criticism.

But we will hear Mr. Menzel a little further. "The universities," he proceeds to say, "have been converted into manufactories for books and book-makers." This, as a statement of fact, has its true side; as a complaint it is hardly reasonable. The German universities are, indeed, manufactories of such book-makers as Heyne, Wolf, Hermann, Böckh, O. Müller, to mention only a few of this class of authors, and they have, in the course of their lives, consumed some paper and probably created a greater demand for rags. Perhaps it were better, had they been tillers of the soil, or mechanics, or good square-built

Dutch merchants, or editors of the "Literaturblätter," or deputies of the Wirtemberg chamber for Bahlingen. But the universities have not created the political condition of Germany, and made it unlike that of France, England or America; they are rather the creature than the creator of these circumstances. If they were all to be closed by authority, the national spirit would soon burst them open. Again. "True cultivation is always an affair of the people; scholastic learning an affair of a class, of a caste." That is, if we understand it, universities, and consequently literary and scientific men trained in them, stand in the way of the education of the people. Yet what but the deep fountains of learning have ever sent forth truly refreshing streams of knowledge to the people? Can a system of French encyclopedias, or nature's balsam after the receipt of Rousseau, or the green-houses of the German Philanthropists ever produce an intelligent and vigorous race of men? If the author intends by this remark, that it is unfavorable to general intelligence for a certain class of men to devote themselves to letters, nothing is more false; and we refer to the population of Prussia and Saxony as its best refutation. If he means, that the higher schools of learning are inaccessible to the people, we reply, that they are thrown open to all classes alike. If the universities are prejudicial to general culture, why does not France, which is so free from this national evil, exhibit a more intelligent population than Germany?

The writer has not yet exhausted his zeal on this theme. He goes on to ask: "But did light proceed from the school, or did it not always enter the school from without? Were Abelard, and Huss, and Thomasius, and Lessing, school-men?" We return the question, 'Were they *not* school-men?' Abelard studied at Paris, and afterwards became the most renowned lecturer there, and could number such men as Peter of Lombardy, St. Bernard and Berenger among his disciples. Huss was a student, a teacher, and finally a rector, in the university of Prague. Thomasius was a student at Leipsic and Frankfort, a professor in the former, and afterwards the founder and director of the university of Halle. Lessing, though a student both in the gymnasium and the university, betrayed, indeed, uneasiness under the restraints of a student's life. But even he afterwards became a salaried librarian,

a kind of scholastic office in Germany. The salutary reform effected by these men did not spring from their opposition to learned schools, neither did it, to any considerable extent, "enter the school from without." We, in our turn, have a question no less pertinent, to propound. Were not Reuchlin, Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Winckelmann, Gesner, Ernesti and Heyne school-men? Did not "light proceed from the school?"

We will connect with the foregoing what the author says in a similar spirit in his chapter on education. With truly Gothic ferocity, this gentleman and scholar assails the promoters of classical literature. "When will the German recover from his love of extravagance?" he asks, in his indignation at the amount of study exacted of the young.—"These gentlemen must make up their minds to lower their educational demands."—"The remedy lies as near as can be, and it requires all the blindness of German pedantry not to see it."—"If gentlemen would but do this," "gentlemen would wait until the mind of the young had become a little riper," is his courtly French style. But after saying that "the classicists will tolerate no separate practical schools," that "the arrogant claims of the classicists deserve to be utterly condemned," he becomes Teutonic again, and assumes the form of the address direct to such men as Thiersch (whom he calls by name on the preceding page), Hermann and Böckh. "You complain of the falling off of philology, but fail to observe in what the cause of the trouble consists. The true cause consists in the degeneracy of philology itself,—in the tendency to *minutiae*. You have broken up the ancient and simple grammar into ten times ten thousand refinements, and have created an archæology for your edification, in whose labyrinthine windings even you can no more find your way. One of you hunts particularly after rare subjunctives or genitives; another after rare constructions and marginal notes of the scholiasts; and, while your vanity sets this costly dessert on the table for the young, they are deprived of wholesome, hearty household fare."—"I say this for your own advantage. I could say much more in praise of that useful knowledge which you have so shamefully treated, for this is much more important than your pursuits."—"First and foremost, you deserve to be upbraided for the falsehood of the reproaches

you have cast upon the practical schools, as mischievous and useless, when you have yourselves hindered their prosperity."—"How ridiculous you make yourselves, by talking of the indirect advantages which your classical philology secures to the young,—of the sharpening of the understanding by the logic of the Latin language,—of exalting the feelings by familiarity with the greatness of the ancients."—"Who shall judge of the wants of national education? Shall only old, incarnate philologists, Graecomaniacs? No!" This is being pretty familiar; and it reminds us of a passage in another part of the book which, for its truth, deserves to be transcribed in this connection. It is this: "Hengstenberg—has been filled with wrath; and indeed I respect his wrath, for I have enough of it myself."

What has frequently been said of the author's English turn of mind, must be received with some abatement. He is, indeed, in general, an admirer of the English, more especially their political character. He joins with the most violent of the English in casting reproach upon his own nation. But he is influenced by motives of a more personally polemic character than any of the English despisers of Germany. When he lays aside his negative polemic criticism, and appears as the propounder or defender of positive doctrines, we sometimes find him very un-English,—we find him as cloudy and mystical and whimsical as any other German. In confirmation of the declaration now made, we refer to his fanciful view of religion, and to what he is pleased to say of animal magnetism, the transmigration of souls, and of Oken's physical theory of the world. In his chapter on religion, among other things, he says:

"The soul is an inward paradise, out of which the four sacred streams flow into the world. The first fountain is opened in the senses, the second in the will, the third in the feeling, and the fourth in thought."—"In the religious element they take their common origin, &c."—"There are consequently four temperaments according as one of these four primeval elements predominates in the soul."—"In relation to climatic and geographical differences, it appears that the senses are most at home in the south, will in the north, feeling in the east, and understanding in the west. In this regard, we observe, not without significance, a certain religious diagonal, running from the south-west to the north-east. The nations of the south and east form a general contrast to those in the north and west; and this contrast harmonizes with that of

the sexes. The nations of the south-east—have a more feminine, the nations of the north-west a more masculine religious character.” “The oldest mythical religions were more connected with the senses, and in Judaism elevated themselves to an ethical character. With Christianity began the religion of feeling; and that has now passed into the religion of the understanding.”

Here we see some of the buds and blossoms of the Schellingian philosophy, just enough to enable us to interpret his rhapsodies in praise of that gigantic system-maker, of the cloud-capt Görres, and of Oken. In justice, however, to our author's fertile genius, we must say, that all his speculations of this kind,—and they are not a few,—are very pretty, and even poetically fine; and the only thing that displeases us is, that he is so earnest about it, and so stoutly affirms that “they are susceptible of a geometrical demonstration.”

In vol. II, p. 218, the author has occasion to speak of animal magnetism. He there says: “This discovery is certainly one of the most important that was ever made,(!) and does our country especial honor.”

“As to the general doctrine of the transmigration of souls,” he inquires in the same chapter, “should it be so utterly condemned without further examination?”

“I will not, indeed, make use of the obvious analogy of insanity, of demoniacal possession of dreams, in which more than one soul seems to be active in the same body at once, to found upon it an argument for the transmigration of the soul; but when I consider the inclination of men for finery, for travelling, for history, for poetry, for the theatre, for novelty in general, an original and very innocent, and even necessary tendency of the soul to renounce itself, and to surrender itself to something foreign, in order, at last, to appropriate it, appears to be indicated therein.”—“If our existence continues, our endless passion for knowledge and life, which is always the passion for change, at the same time must still increase.”—“The passion for knowledge cannot rest satisfied with the mere external appearance; it must by transformation penetrate immediately into the foreign matter. Then, at length, we know a thing entirely, when we have ourselves become the very thing.”(!)

According to Menzel's view, Schelling's system is the great wide-spreading tree of the true philosophy, in the branches of which every other system of any value is found; and that, among these, none is to be compared with Oken's. “As I have indicated the principle of Schelling ('the profoundest principle of the philosophy of nature—the unity of all the parts of nature'), I will briefly sketch also the system of Oken, which manifestly has

more genius than all others." With such pomp and splendor does he seriously and earnestly introduce eight pages of nonsense, of which the following paragraph may serve as a specimen :

"Ether is, according to Oken, the indifferent original matter in which, by means of polarization between the pole of light and the pole of gravity, the extremest tension takes place; but this tension is again in the reaction moderated by warmth, inasmuch as warmth has the tendency of equalizing and converting it into ether again. Now, therefore, in proportion as these three powers predominate in the ether, it is resolved into the original elements. The element, light, is oxygen, weight is carbon, caloric is hydrogen. They are, however, constantly united with one another, because these powers always operate together, though in different proportions. According to this, the elements are formed. Where hydrogen predominates, there is air; where oxygen, water; where carbon, earth. But their universal, primeval element, the ethereal, is fire; for every effect wrought in ether proceeds from light and warmth, and is, consequently, fire. The world originated from fire; it is fire cooled down, and will again perish in fire. The sun is fire, red. The nearest planets round it, Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Vesta, Juno, Ceres and Pallas, are earth, yellow. Jupiter and Saturn are water, green. Uranus is air, blue. The comets are the remaining ether, which tends to become air. The elements operate upon each other. Air and water cause the positive, air and earth the negative, electricity. In this mutual operation upon each other, the two elements produce the third; air and earth produce water in rain; air and water produce the earth in the meteoric stones,—both electrical productions. Earth, in union with some one of the other elements, produces the minerals. But when the three elements, air, water and earth, are blended, the first organization, that of plants, results, and when the fourth element, fire, is added, animal existence results."

As we have made some pretty strong assertions in regard to our author's party feelings, and intimated that he is grossly abusive in the manner, as well as unjust in the matter, of what he says of his literary opponents, it remains for us to substantiate these statements by clear evidence. By some secret, but undoubtedly profound, principle of nature, which none but Oken can explain, the vice of an individual extends not only to all his tribe, but to the very face of the country where he lives. Hence we read, "Eichhorn's Literary History is as cold and dry, is as proudly and scientifically aristocratic, as every thing else that comes from Göttingen;" and again, "Hegel, although born in Suabia, could only make his fortune in Berlin. He must have men before him, who were not enchanted by the mighty influence of beautiful mountain scenery,"

who "only know a state, a state machine, servants of the state, dependents of the state, and those to whose very climate it belongs to deny every thing else, and admit only themselves." We shrewdly suspect these phenomena must be explained by that "north-west" and "south-east" "contrast," which "harmonizes with that of the sexes."

Krug, the author of the Philosophical Dictionary, "flattered the half-educated," according to Menzel, "by a superficial universality," "and was very busy in the league of Paulus and Voss against the poor romanticists and mystics." A man leagued with Voss must be very bad. *Hinc ille lacrymæ.* "The oracle of provincial and inferior spirits," "he surrendered his philosophy to political influence, and was one of the first liberal clamorers, as long as clamoring was allowed, and was one of the most cowardly sneaks, the moment it was no longer permitted."

The reader is by this time prepared to anticipate the treatment which the great translator and poet Voss would receive from Menzel's hands. We must limit ourselves to a few selections, for his inuendoes pervade the whole work.

"Voss made out of words a language, which was neither German nor Greek, and which had first to be translated into Greek in order to be understood." "Homer, Hesiod, Theocritus, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Shakspeare, &c., are as much alike in the translations of Voss, as one egg is like another," and "the character of the original is falsified." "This detestable opinion has been openly expressed by Voss, a man who seems to see every where only black and white." "How much soever a Voss may strive to turn himself into an old Greek, he remains for ever an uncouth boor of Lower Saxony." "A freak of nature—impelled Voss, the most extraordinary of all literary pedants, to a tragicomical passion for Grecian grace." "There never has been an old woman who busied herself, with such tiresome self-complacency, about petty, womanish household affairs, domestic entertainments, family visiting and godfatherings, on the one hand, and womanish tale-telling, pouting, gossiping, suspecting and calumniating, on the other, as this Johan Heinrich; and so he passes on down the path of ages, in damask night-gown and nicely washed night-cap." "Among these sham fighters, Johan Heinrich Voss took one of the foremost places. He understood the art of passing for a liberal friend of the people, while he made his bow before every power, kissed hands all round, fawned upon princes and courts, and obtained for himself handsome pensions from the great."

Perhaps the most glaring instance of personal abuse is to be found in the case of Müller, the justly distinguished

historian of Switzerland. We reluctantly defile our pages with quotations, which for a double reason shall be brief.

"Scarcely ever has the German public been more basely deceived. This man was Johannes Müller, for whom of all the German writers, I entertain the deepest contempt. Under the mask of a republican, he served and betrayed every patron. Under the mask of freedom, he was always a cringer; under the mask of patriotism, a traitor; under the mask of honesty and integrity, an accomplished knave." "We have further to thank the worthless Johannes Müller for the introduction of the most affected style in historical composition. This dishonorable soul, which had no feeling for the truth, was naturally unable to play the hypocrite, except in fine speeches."

Such is the strain in which he speaks of this great and good man through six entire pages. He does nearly equal injustice to the jurist Hugo, the poet Steiglitz, to Schlegel, Paulus, Böttiger, and many others. Of his crusade against Göthe, against whom he cherishes the most unrelenting hatred, we forbear to speak. It is needless to say that the praise which is unjustly withheld from some, is as unjustly bestowed upon others. Though far from having exhausted the catalogue of sins which might be charged against our author, we have, we think, sufficiently sustained the unfavorable opinion expressed at the commencement of this article; at least, as honest critics, we have now disburdened our consciences.

We therefore propose to ourselves in the next place, the more pleasing task of illustrating what we said of the author's great merits.

It is a difficult matter to judge impartially, where good and bad qualities are found together. As splendid virtues are likely to blind us to one's defects, so glaring faults tend to prejudice our minds against one's merits. A few instances of gross injustice, when detected in a man, put us out of humor with him, and we are tempted not to trust his honesty in any case. We confess that we have burned with indignation while reading some passages in our author, and, in such a state of mind, it were easy to draw sweeping conclusions unfavorable both to his heart and to his intellect.

But however well-grounded such an occasional feeling of indignation may be, Menzel is, after all, a writer that cannot be put down by any authoritative tone of the critic. He has, beyond all question, a mind of a high order, as

every candid reader of his entire work will readily acknowledge. He is deeply versed in German literature. Not only is his reading immense, but his power of ready apprehension is great. He penetrates at once the spirit of a production, and ascertains, seemingly without effort, its centre and circumference. He generalizes with skill, and is never lost in a labyrinth of details. Besides, he is a keen and practical observer of men and things. When his passions are still, and his fancy not too lively, he says as true things as are to be found in the language. No where is the German character more admirably described, than in some of his happier sketches. No where do we see the petty duke, the intriguing minister, the placeman, the stiff professor, the literary *précieux*, the dreaming philosopher, the insipid dealer in Rationalistic pulpit morality, and the contented, stupid cit, who cares for nothing but his bread, his beer and his pipe, drawn more to the life than in those characteristic touches which lend their charm to this book.

It were easy to demonstrate the truth of these remarks by hundreds of examples; we select a few :

"While a multitude of unbelievers....boldly renounced the church....a peculiar species of miners was forming within the church, who lived in the same unbelief, though under the forms of the church and the mask of orthodoxy. Smilingly these gentlemen teach the beloved theological youth, that unbelief is the true, apostolical, and original Christian faith, demonstrated by reason and Scripture. \* \* \* There is something touching, if you will, in the life-long toil of working up the prodigious primeval forest of the Bible, whose roots strike deep, which towers to heaven, which is interwoven with thousands of creeping plants, tendrils, and luxuriant flowers, by means of exegetical rooting out, weeding and clipping, into a bald, rational system, of some half-disciple of Kant or Hegel [why not Schelling, too?], crossed by a couple of yew hedges, mathematically cut out according to the principles of French gardening, and moderately vivified by a little philosophical fountain. It is tragical, at least, if, when the task is completed, in some fifty years, and the stout laborer wishes to enjoy his work, behold, other people come there, who see the primeval forest still standing,—the ancient sacred forest, against which the axe never strikes, and all that the laborer had accomplished was deception; he had hewn down the forest only in his imagination; the little shaven garden of yews existed only in his rational faith of the head."—Vol. I, pp. 165—167.

Much fancy as there is in this sketch, there is still more truth; and multitudes in Germany are now rejoicing in this new proof that no power shall be permitted to prevail against the church.

In vindication of a deep religious feeling in opposition to the low Rationalists, who scarcely retain even the shreds of a religious sentiment, Mr. Menzel observes with equal truth and beauty :

"Mysticism has been called, not without reason, the night-shade of life. Night has her spectres, but she has also her stars. \* \* \* Deride only nocturnal spectres, but reverence holy night. When the sun sets, the everlasting stars come forth; when the every-day work is done, there is awakened in us the consciousness of another, an everlasting life. From the surface, the mind looks into the depth, from visible effects to mysterious causes and consequences, from the present to the beginning and the end. Nay, there is a bottomless deep of things, there is a God, an eternity; and man himself springs from an origin as profound, and is destined for something more than the vulgar affairs of every day. Therefore, the aspirations of the human mind which are closely connected with the idea of that higher, everlasting order, in which our petty existence is lost, belong not to the company of mere fantasies and transient phenomena."—pp. 190—192.

We will not deny that this beautiful picture is tinged with colors ground and mixed by Schelling; and that there is a little too much vagueness in "that everlasting order in which our petty existence is lost;" still the representation is full of the most interesting and important truth.

The following view of the intellectual character of the Germans is not a fancy sketch :

"At all times, they manifested an excessive strength, and fulness of mind, which broke out from within, and took little heed of external things. At all times the Germans were, in practical life, more helpless than other nations, but more at home in the inner world; all their national virtues and vices can be traced back to this introspection, intellectuality, speculativeness. It is this which makes us eminently a literary people at present, and stamps, at the same time, a peculiar impress upon our literature. The writings of other nations are more practical, because their life is more practical; ours have a dash of the supernatural, or the unnatural,—something ghostly, strange, which does not accommodate itself to the world, because we have always in our eye only the wondrous world of our inward being. We are more fantastic than other people, not only because our fantasy branches out from reality into the monstrous, but because we choose to consider our dreams as truth. \* \* \* Meantime this is only the dark side, on which we certainly do not wish to deceive ourselves. On the other hand, our intellectual and literary activity has also a bright side, which is much less appreciated by foreigners. We strive after a universal cultivation of the mind, and sacrifice to it, not in vain, our active energy and our national pride. The acquisitions which we gain might indeed be more useful to the human race than the so called great actions; and our eagerness to learn from foreigners ought to do us more honor than a

victory over them. There lies in our national character an entirely peculiar tendency to humanity. We desire to grasp all human things rightly, at the central point, and, in the endless multiplicity of life, to solve the riddle of the hidden unity. Therefore we lay hold of the great work of knowledge on all sides."—pp. 32—34.

All who are conversant with German literature have been struck with its independence both in thought and style,—its freedom from the uniformity of a moulding public sentiment and of fixed, standard forms of expression. These characteristics are thus noticed by our author :

"The German language is the perfect expression of the German character. It has followed the German mind in all its depths, and in its widest circuit. It corresponds exactly to the multiplicity of intellectual characters, and has bestowed upon each the peculiar tone which distinguishes it more decidedly than any other language possibly could. \* \* \* All attempts to impose on German authors a regular usage in language have been ignominiously wrecked, because they fought against nature. Every author writes as he likes; every one may say of himself with Göthe,

"I sing as sings the bird  
That on the branches lives."—p. 37.

We will introduce here a few sensible remarks on the subject of writing for the common people :

"Of itself, the effort to write intelligibly, and to instruct uneducated contemporaries, is as laudable as the learned pretension, which flourishes away with its hieroglyphic speech, and prides itself that the great mass cannot understand it, is contemptible. Even the little accuracy with which scientific subjects must be treated in popular discourse, and the feeble tone which steals into it, are partly to be excused on account of the public, by whose powers of comprehension, the author must be guided, if he would be heard and understood. Meantime, it is not to be mistaken, that it is only the multitude of obscure authors who do here also, the most mischief. Even the shallowest head assumes to write for the people, while he would be ashamed to write for the educated. Every body considers the people good enough to make an audience, and bad enough to have the most stupid stuff palmed off upon them. Nothing appears so easy as to write for the people; for the less art one devotes to it, the sooner is he understood; the more negligent he is,—the more vulgar and common-place stuff he writes,—the more he harmonizes with the mass of readers. The more he descends to the narrowness, the brutality, the prejudices, the unworthy propensities of the mass, the more they are flattered, and he is flattered by them. Hence it is easy and profitable for bad writers to write badly for the people; hence the work is carried on to a criminal excess. But to write well for the people is a very difficult thing, and therefore is so rarely done. If one would improve and ennoble the mass, he incurs the danger of displeasing them. If one would instruct them in higher things, it is

extremely difficult to strike the right tone. Either he has the subject too exclusively before his eyes, and discourses upon it in too learned and unintelligible a style, or he regards the multitude too exclusively, and profanes the subject by a mode of treatment altogether too trivial, and often burlesque. In this matter, authors fail as often as preachers." —pp. 81—83.

We reluctantly break away from the long list of passages marked for insertion, in which the author appears to good advantage, and in which the reader would find much to soften his displeasure against one whose misfortune it is to be found sometimes unwise and sometimes unkind. By resorting to the work itself, he will learn much that none but a native writer of great talent and erudition could teach him; and if he be on his guard, where the author's besetting sins are most likely to cause him to deal in misrepresentation, there will be no great danger of imbibing serious errors.

In conclusion, we must say a word of the manner in which the translator has executed his laborious task. And, in general, we cannot do otherwise than award him high praise. In the first place, the translation has the ease and sprightliness of an original production. It is set forth in genuine English, with a rare copiousness of good words, and with a virgin purity of idiom. There are, indeed, exceptions to this remark, but they are few. Nearly equal commendation may be bestowed upon the fidelity of the translation. It is true we have compared only one of the four volumes of the original; but as this was the first, we may fairly presume that the remaining three, executed after a familiarity with the author's style of thought and expression had been acquired, are translated with equal, if not superior skill. We say nearly equal commendation. For it is evident, that, notwithstanding all the translator's philological tact, and all his industry, yet he is not quite at home in the German language. It may be justly pleaded, that Menzel is such an original writer, so abounding in pithy sayings, and allusions to whatever is striking in the whole world of literature,—allusions, too, which would often be unperceived by the unpractised eye,—that it is very pardonable for one sometimes to mistake his meaning. Yet the errors found in the translation occur quite as frequently as otherwise, in phrases that are plain and simple to one who

has mastered the idioms of the language. It is obvious that the translator did not, in these cases, resort to the literary friends, whose assistance he acknowledges in his preface.

Of the few cases of awkward translation that occur, we mention only the following as examples. It is perfectly dignified and even elegant in German, to use the word, "Kopf," *head*, in connections where in good English, *mind*, *talent*, *genius* or *man*, would be the corresponding word. Of this we are far from supposing the translator to be ignorant. Still, the reader often falls upon such sentences as these: "We observe a constant warfare of original *heads* against the schools."\* "The better *heads* of the eighteenth and of the present century," &c.† "Their best *heads* gave themselves up to secular sciences."‡ The words "somebody-else-ian,"|| and "the never-sufficiently-to-be-praised Thomasius,"§ are not altogether to our taste; and we would make the same remark of "still-stand," "unnature," and other expressions of the kind.

Many of the errors in translation are unimportant; still they are errors, and we proceed to point out such as we have noticed, limiting ourselves, as intimated above, to the first volume of the original.

#### MR. FELTON'S TRANSLATION.

Page 6, line 16. "We have scarcely a *larger body of peasants* than of scribblers."

P. 11, l. 27. "We learn words by heart, and feel ourselves set beyond the trouble *even of thinking*."

P. 19, l. 26. "They *might, indeed*, like the dogstar, hover freely over the blooming summer."

P. 20, l. 21. "The poor village pastor has before him a dozen books and half a dozen *college essays*, and so he writes a new book."

#### CORRECTED TRANSLATION AND REMARKS.

"We have scarcely *more distinguished countrymen*, than those who are authors." Grössere Landsleute. The translator must have had in mind another word, Landleute.

"We learn, &c., and feel ourselves released from the trouble of *thinking for ourselves*."—fühlt sich der Mühe üeberhoben, selbst zu denken.

"They *would gladly hover*," &c. —Sie möchten gern.

—“a dozen books and half a dozen *manuscript lectures*.”—Collegienschriften.

\* Vol. I, p. 45.      † p. 52.      ‡ p. 117.      || p. 165.      § p. 146.

P. 20, l. 28. "Since the last political excitement,—books have been written on administration, and constitutions, the greatest part of which only had reference to definite localities and particular *moments*."

P. 26, l. 31. "Instead of taking pride in our *riches*, we ought—to compress—the results of our book-wisdom."

P. 42, l. 32. "Absolutely every thing."

P. 52, l. 13. "We ought *also* to hold the schools in high honor."

P. 53, l. 29. "It is the curse of schools that they are not satisfied with a few masters, but must needs have a multitude of subalterns—*whose usefulness is increased in proportion to their number*."

P. 57, l. 24. "Nothing does more harm to culture than national *ignorance*."

P. 75, l. 28. "Ever since the invention of printing, the warfare of confessions of faith has deluged Germany with theological writings."

P. 78, l. 19. "Of three good writers, *one, at least, enjoys his apotheosis in the future*."

P. 84, l. 22. "As the political *press* in Germany has generally favored a *sluggish immobility*," &c.

P. 108, l. 29. "Our age *alone*." So p. 106, l. 22. "The greater part of men move carelessly—over the surface of religious life; but a *few only* are urged on, by an inward compulsion."

P. 118, l. 16. "It were, indeed, surprising, if the austerer morality of Protestantism *should gain no advantage*, without Protestant pedantry."

The last word should have been translated *topics* or *interests*. The German word, *Moment*, means, in philosophical language, a *point* or *part*, *ingredient*, &c. So p. 196, l. 18, it should have been *parts*, instead of "moving forces."

"Instead of taking pride in the *abundance* [of our books], we ought," &c. Here the sense may have been rightly apprehended, but it is certainly not well expressed.

"*Almost* every thing."—fast Alles.

"We ought, *therefore*, &c. The word *also*, in German, never corresponds to that word in English.

— "whose number for the most part, they still needlessly augment." und deren Zahl in der Regel noch unnütz vermehren.

— "than national *conceitedness*," or vanity.—Nationaldünkel.

"Not long after the invention of printing," &c. Schon bald nach. There was a considerable interval between the invention of printing and Luther's time.

"Of three good writers, not more than one enjoys his apotheosis until the future."—erhält wenigstens einer erst [not till] in der Zukunft seine Apotheose.

"As political *oppression* has universally favored a *mean cupidity* (?) Druck—banausische [*βαραυσική*] Versessenheit.

"But our age." Allein unsre Zeit.

— "but *some* are urged on."—allein Einzelne werden getrieben.

— "if the austerer Protestant morality *could not be attained* without Protestant pedantry."—nicht zu gewinnen wäre.

P. 138, l. 7. "Others have a terror of the old Adam, of original sin, and of all the errors which they commit unconsciously, and which they denounce in order to secure salvation."

P. 139, l. 9. "Unlike the Catholic, it [Protestant literature] has a higher significance for the Confession, and a greater influence upon the *household of the confession*."

P. 141, l. 12. "Apart from this perversion of *Scripture*."

P. 143, l. 13. "It [a clock] exists, provided it goes."

P. 146, l. 23. "The subaltern clerical functions are exercised as the higher departments."

P. 150, l. 2. "The religious *doctrinaires* endeavored to support the sounding word by more consistent works."

P. 150, l. 14. "Let us not deceive ourselves by supposing that these innovations are for the most part proportionate to the end, and excellent in device; but that they meet with opposition, because they are something imposed from the upper classes."

P. 170, l. 15. "Steffen's spirited 'Lamentations over False Theology,' contain also a great deal of truth."

P. 170, l. 16. "The supernaturalists, who acknowledge without reservation whatever is supernatural in Christianity, without criticising or explaining it,—nay, who are willing, like Schleiermacher, to pass quietly over whatever is inexplicable," &c.

P. 178, l. 4. "— which were formerly found in magnetism."

— "which they commit unconsciously, and which threaten to overthrow their salvation."—und die sie um die Seligkeit zu bringen drohen.

— "is of more importance to the creeds, and exerts a greater influence upon *works of a kindred character with the creeds*," i. e., any books which are relied on in matters of faith.

— "perversion of the *press*."—der Schrift; writing, here used in its most general sense.

"It exists, in order that it may go."—Sie ist da, damit sie geht.

"The subaltern clergy are drilled like the rest of the army of placemen."—wird exercirt wie das übrige Beamtenehre.

— "prop up the *sinking word with more substantial works*,"—das verhallende Wort durch consistenter Werke zu stützen.

"We do not deny that these innovations are, for the most part, judicious [zweckmäßig] and excellent; but they meet with opposition, because they come as a command from those in authority." The import of the translation is directly opposite to that of the original.

We know of no such man as "Steffen," nor of such a work as "Lamentations over False Theology." Steffens wrote a work "On False Theology and the True Faith," and to this we suppose the author refers, without intending to give the title.

"Without wishing to criticise, or explain, or even to quiet themselves, like Schleiermacher, in regard to what is inexplicable," &c. — ohne es bekritteln, oder erklären, ja nur über das Unerklärliche sich wie Schleiermacher beruhigen zu wollen.

— "which are found,"—die sonst im Magnetismus liegen.

P. 184, l. 19. "So far as they established an external church, they acknowledged allegiance *unlike* the other Protestants, not only to the faith of feeling, but also to a faith of the word."

P. 190, l. 22. "To complain of spectres is to the purpose; *at best we laugh at them.*"

P. 205, l. 4. "— an ass's bridge for *the evil spirit.*"

P. 236, l. 14. "Thus Clodius, Chr. Weisse, and Köppen carried back this view in the most general form to Krause, and even as far as Leibnitz."

P. 247, l. 5. "His disciples fell again into partial views, *nay, have been since still more led away* by this or that particular tendency of the age."

So p. 272, l. 6. —"even after single sciences," &c.

P. 269, l. 30. "For the most part we find."

"Inasmuch as they established an external church, they, *like* the other Protestants, acknowledged," &c.—*huldigten sie noch gleich den übrigen Protestanten.*

"To complain of spectres, is well; *but it is best of all to laugh at them*,"—am besten, man lacht darüber.

— "for the indolent mind,"—für das faule Gemüth.

"So Clodius, and Weisse, and Köppen, till Krause most completely developed this view, and carried it back even as far as to Leibnitz."

— So Clodius, Chr. Weisse, Köppen, bis Krause diese Ansicht am vielseitigsten durch—und bis auf Leibnitz zurückführte.

— "fell again into partial views, *according as they were borne away* more by this or that tendency," &c.—je nachdem sie mehr von dieser oder jener Richtung des Zeitgeistes fortgezogen wurden.

— "according as the several sciences," &c.

"Most of all, are we struck with."

These are the principal errors which we have been able to detect in the translation, as far as we have extended our examination; and those who are conversant with this species of labor, will agree with us, that their amount does not surpass reasonable expectation.

We regret that the translator has been so sparing of his notes. There are, in this author, innumerable passages, which, as they now stand in the translation, will be as unintelligible as Chinese to the majority of readers. We refer not so much to words as to things,—to facts, and events, and circumstances, familiar to the Germans, but not so to Americans.

Upon the whole, we regard the work as deserving a place in the series of "Specimens of Foreign Literature," of which it forms the seventh, eighth and ninth volumes, and the translation as having merits of so high an order, that its defects almost disappear in the comparison.

EDITOR.

## ARTICLE IV.

## PHILIP'S LIFE OF MILNE.

*The Life and Opinions of the Rev. WILLIAM MILNE, D. D., Missionary to China, illustrated by Biographical Annals of Asiatic Missions from primitive to Protestant Times, intended as a Guide to Missionary Spirit.* By ROBERT PHILIP, Author of the Life and Times of Bunyan and Whitefield; the Experimental Guides, &c. New York: Appleton & Co. 1840. 12mo., pp. 320.

*The same.\** Philadelphia: Herman Hooker. 1840. 12mo., pp. 430.

"Of making many books there is no end." Certainly, of making such a book as this there need be no end. We find no fault with the sentiments which are scattered upon its pages. These are generally sound, and some of them deserve to be deeply pondered by the missionaries of the present day, and by all those who are directly or indirectly engaged in conducting the business of missions. It is our intention to discuss a portion of these sentiments, in the course of this article. We feel convinced that they will be found important and seasonable. But we are now speaking of the literary character of the work. On this point, candor and justice forbid us to speak in flattering terms. As to style and plan, the present is inferior to all Mr. Philip's works. When he began to acquire notoriety as an author, he labored to give every thing that came from his hands a finished excellence, which might insure readers, and win the approving eye of competent judges. But of such labor his hands have plainly grown weary. And now, trusting apparently to past fame, he sends forth books that bear the marks of hurry and carelessness. This may be the fault of his publishers. It is possible that they press him faster than his intellect allows, and, by

\* It is not within our province to inquire into the history of these rival editions. Questions of dispute between publishers must be referred to another tribunal.—ED.

urging his mind to undue exertion, are giving a blow to his reputation as an author. Such cases are not rare. Almost every writer, who has gained popular celebrity, is tempted by his publishers to emit works more rapidly than is consistent with his own interest or fame. On the supposition that any production, bearing the sanction of his name, will be favorably received by the reading public, he is persuaded to ply his pen upon nearly every subject on which a book or a tract is needed. But the consequences of this course are sure to prove fatal. His productions decline in interest, cease to be welcomed with pleasure, and are at length read more as a duty than as a privilege, till they cease to be read at all, and remain in long rows upon the bookseller's shelves.

These remarks are, to some extent, true respecting Mr. Philip. His latter works have declined in interest. They are less scholar-like than their predecessors. They seem thrown together in haste, much in the same way that a mechanic sometimes loosely frames his work, after he has acquired reputation, and feels disposed to rely upon that, rather than upon a continuance of those efforts by which his reputation was gained, and by which alone it can be preserved. But what is more serious, the latter productions of this author occasionally betray an over-weaning conceit, that leads him into unamiable treatment towards other sects of Christians. We find no objection to a man's being warmly attached to his own denomination, and seizing upon every proper opportunity to support its claims, and recommend its excellences. It is to be supposed that his partiality for his own sect is founded upon principle; and, therefore, in being its advocate, he is only acting out the dictates of honesty. But whether he appear in the character of an advocate or a defender, a modest and kind spirit is indispensable. Against this rule, Mr. Philip has transgressed. We do not think that he is either specially modest or specially kind in his allusions to other sects. Thus, in his life of Bunyan, he treats the Baptists with a degree of flippancy that made us hesitate whether to smile or frown. We have already, however, in a former number of this Review, passed our censure upon this breach of courtesy, and exposed to view the flimsiness of his argument against immersion. It is not therefore necessary to repeat our remarks on this

subject. We have now alluded to it, simply for the purpose of illustrating the observation which we made respecting the unamiable manner with which Mr. Philip thinks it to be his duty to treat other sects of Christians. Were additional illustrations necessary, we could point out several passages in the work now lying before us, which appear like the ebullitions of a tart temper towards the Episcopal church. To call them by the mildest name which truth would sanction, they are side thrusts, that never yet produced any other effect than to irritate those who are assailed. Why, then, should a writer ever indulge so perverted a taste? If he compose a work intended for general circulation, why should he place on its pages any thing which is calculated to defeat his designs? When will men learn to be truly catholic in their feelings? When will they learn to look kindly upon all, who, by whatever name called, yet bear the image of Jesus Christ?

We have said that the style and plan of this *Life of Milne* are open to animadversion. The former is not only inelegant in many places, but exceedingly loose. It is marked in some cases by improprieties, and in others by a faultiness of construction, that renders it difficult to see how an eye of taste could have scanned such sentences, without being struck with their want of beauty and strength. Thus, the very first sentence in the book contains the following phrase: "he could not *witness* (behold?) unmoved nor unprofited, the scenery," &c. But let us look at the sentence immediately following. "It is hardly either sublime or beautiful scenery; but there is enough of both in it to make any one feel that a shepherd-boy, of even ordinary talents, (talent?) who is (was?) out in all weathers, (weather?) could not be (have been?) utterly uninfluenced by it." A man may *talk* in this loose way, but should any one *write* so? The "sublime and beautiful" are *qualities*, and it is scarcely good English to say that they are *in a scene*. "To make any one feel," signifies to *excite emotion*. But this is a very different idea from the one intended, which is, to *produce conviction*. Criticism might justly ask, to what does the closing syllable in the sentence refer, to weathers, scenery, or the quality of the scenery? Let us, however, expect improvement as we proceed. "Mr. Milne certainly was

not." Was not what? Why, was not the shepherd-boy who could not be uninfluenced by such scenery. Exactly the contrary of what was intended by the author. But let us not despair. "I am not quite sure, now, that I have stood *with* him upon the corner of the hill above Reeskhause, when we were boys, admiring the hoary grandeur of 'the Tap of Noth,' and the silvery windings of 'the bonny Baggio,' in the valley between the hill and the mountain; but I remember well the mutual zest with which we often talked of those scenes,

'Over the hills, and far away,'

when we met in England." If any one does not readily see how this advances the thought, the sentence can be read again. Perhaps others may be more successful than ourselves.

We shall not pursue these remarks upon the style of Mr. Philip. What has been said is sufficient to establish the justice of our observation, that he is beginning to write carelessly. Our example has been taken from the opening paragraph of the book. Before dismissing that paragraph, we can hardly help asking whether the whole of it is in good taste? Its object is to introduce us to the subject of the biography. But in the fourth sentence, the author introduces himself, and takes care, to the end, that he shall not be forgotten. This looks to us very like a gentleman bringing an interesting stranger, to present him to us, and, after the first two or three words, speaking as if it were of more importance that we should know him, than the stranger.

Let us now contemplate the plan of the work. The chief fault of this is its want of unity. The book seems, indeed, to have no design whatever. Let any one read over the table of contents, and we will forgive him, if he is surprised that such a list of subjects is to constitute the Life of Milne. One cannot help thinking, indeed, that the author began his labors, supposing that there were rich materials for composing the memoirs, but, finding himself disappointed, was compelled to make up a good sized volume by recourse to such matter as it was in his power to furnish. The truth is, this book should have been either larger or smaller. If the author concluded to treat of all the subjects which he has mentioned, he should,

in order to do them justice, and advance the knowledge of the reader, have written three volumes, instead of one. Or else he should have omitted many of these subjects, and confined his efforts to the task of illustrating the character of the lamented missionary of whom he pretends to write a biography. A book upon the general subject of Christianity in Asia, is one thing. A book purporting to be the Life of Milne, is quite another thing.

We cannot help contrasting, here, the Life of Milne with the Life of Mrs. Judson, and noticing how favorable is the contrast to the ability of our own countryman. In point of religious interest, and biographical excellence, there can hardly be any comparison run between the American and the English work. In one, every chapter increases our acquaintance with the distinguished female, and multiplies facts and incidents illustrative of her character, piety, and labors. Each page makes us feel a deeper interest in the heroine. We become identified with her plans and efforts, and feel our spirits rising or sinking, according to the success or the failure of her attempts to advance the cause of Christ. We follow her with intense anxiety through every scene of hazard and of danger. This continues to the close of her adventurous life. Then, our interest in her has become so deep and absorbing that, having read the account of her last moments, we shut the book with a feeling of sadness and gloom, similar to what we have experienced when coming from the chamber of an expiring friend.

In the Life of Milne, we read chapter after chapter, without feeling that our acquaintance with that eminent missionary is materially increased. We learn a great deal of what Mr. Philip thinks of his friend, but gather very few facts from which we may judge for ourselves. When Mr. Milne has reached India, our interest is awakened. We sympathize with him in his labors, and begin to be identified with him in his arduous pursuits. But these pursuits were continued only a few years, when disease enfeebled and broke his constitution, and death put a period to his toils and sufferings. Thus our interest hardly begins to be excited, before it is allayed. For the remainder of the book (and it is no inconsiderable part) is devoted to the discussion of subjects which have no more connection with Mr. Milne than with any other missionary to the

East. Their effect, of course, is to distract our attention, and weaken the impression already produced. And thus we close a book, purporting to be the life of Milne, with discussions about Syrian missions, Prester John, Lamaism, and the opium crisis; instead of closing it with our minds fixed upon a beloved missionary, filled with admiration of his character, and affected by tender thoughts respecting his untimely exit.

We have made these remarks, in the discharge of that duty which we owe to the public as Christian critics. While no question exists in our minds, that it is of far more importance *what* a man says, than *how* he says it, yet we are persuaded that the latter should never be regarded with indifference. We wish to see our religious publications characterized, not only by moral, but also by literary excellence, convinced that the union of these is necessary to their highest usefulness. If we cannot have both, we should, of course, choose justness of sentiment, rather than elegance of style; but the canons by which we are guided will not allow us to be contented with either alone.

From the author, let us now turn to the subject of this biography. WILLIAM MILNE was born in the parish of Kennethmont, in Aberdeenshire, in the year 1785. At the early age of six years, he lost his father,—an event that placed the care of his education in maternal hands. Of his mother we know nothing. Some information respecting her would have been gratifying, since we generally expect to find that deep piety in a son is capable of being traced, as in the case of Dr. Doddridge, to the instructions that fell from maternal lips. Young Milne gave early signs of great depravity. The account he gives of himself is, that “in profane swearing, and other sins of a like nature, I far exceeded most of my equals, and became vile to a proverb.” This confession reminds us of the wickedness of Bunyan. At the age of thirteen, a partial reformation took place, which produced an outward change of conduct. But he acknowledges that he “was all the time acting under the influence of a self-righteous principle, having never yet felt his need of Christ, in his complete character, nor as a sinner, made any humble application to God, through Christ, for pardon and grace.” Such application, however, he did make,

not long afterwards, and with success. The history of his convictions, and struggles; of his alternations between hope and fear; of his retreat into the woods and sheepcotes, impelled thither by the agonies of his spiritual distress, is extremely interesting, and will be read by the Christian with profit. About this period, young Milne was very fortunate in finding a few eminently pious men, who, though "to fame unknown," yet were rich in faith, and capable of teaching him "the way of the Lord more perfectly." Among these was a weaver, who appears to have united great attainments in religion to an unusually strong understanding and clear intellect. In him, young Milne found a gifted instracter in the doctrines of the gospel, to whom he repaired frequently, and with whom he passed many of his happiest hours.

The church which Mr. Milne joined had already imbibed a deep missionary spirit. Its character, in this respect, had been moulded by its pastor, Mr. Cowie, who appears to have been a man of rare intelligence and primitive piety. So successful had he been in diffusing through his church his own love to the missionary enterprise, that his chapel was called the "Missionary laigh Kirk," and the brethren who preached for him were called "Missionary Ministers." Surrounded by such influences, it is not surprising that Mr. Milne felt so deeply upon the subject of spreading the gospel among the heathen, for "he was 'born again' in the very cradle of missions." His first application to be received as a missionary was rather coolly heard. Whether this repulse was owing to his not having a prepossessing appearance, or to the over-cautious temper of those to whom he applied, remains unknown. Their second thoughts, however, were more wise, and he was accordingly accepted. At the receipt of this intelligence, he sailed from Aberdeen to London, being destined for Gosport, where he was to enjoy the privilege of sitting at the feet of Dr. Bogue. Just before Mr. Milne left Aberdeen, where the author of this work then resided, the latter saw him, and having been acquainted with him from the period of his conversion, pointed out to him the Chinese hieroglyph for friendship,—two pearls of equal size and lustre,—saying that this would be a fair emblem and a fit model for them. This is a very neat compliment to himself, which, Mr. Philip will pardon us for thinking,

would have come with more propriety from the pen of another.

Having completed his studies at Gosport, and allied himself in marriage with Miss Cowie, a lady whose Christian graces shone with peculiar lustre, Mr. Milne embarked on the 4th of September, 1812, at Portsmouth, and sailed for the Cape of Good Hope. His voyage is marked by no incident of importance. He remained at the Cape a short time, during which he was engaged in doing good, as he found opportunity. From thence he sailed for China. While on board the ship, he took a deep interest in her officers and crew, and, on leaving them, gave to one of the former a letter of advice, which breathes a truly Christian spirit, and increases our love and admiration for the man. Being driven from Macao, through the intolerance of the Catholics, he went to Canton, leaving his wife behind. There he became intimately associated with Dr. Morrison, with whom he formed a friendship which ended only at death. These missionaries continued to labor together in the spirit of their divine Master. The most affectionate confidence was mutually cherished. Their prayers, desires and sympathies ran in one channel, nor did any thing occur, during the prosecution of their difficult and trying enterprise, to interrupt their harmony. They were both men of heavenly mould, and had enough Christian greatness to treat with indifference those events which might have been magnified, by smaller men, into causes of jealousy. Each looked at the same grand object, and in their efforts to accomplish it, felt a holy contempt for the question, "which of them should be the greatest?"

The life of Dr. Milne, when he had reached his missionary field, was marked by intense study, indefatigable labor, determined purpose, indomitable perseverance, and strong faith. In all this he was supported in the most efficient manner by his amiable and excellent wife. But of this support he was soon deprived by the ruthless hand of death. Mrs. Milne died at Clay-Bang, near Malacca, March 20, 1819, whither they had both gone, for the purpose of recruiting their health.

The spirit with which Dr. Milne bore this severe stroke,—the severest that can befall humanity,—may be learned from a passage in his journal, which was written

soon after the mournful event had occurred. It manifests the most heavenly resignation, and will be read with sacred pleasure by every Christian. It is the following :

"I feel how hard it is to keep the mind fixed on spiritual subjects—to give a relish for and love of them.—I feel a little detached from earth at this time; but I fear I am not fitter for heaven. O, sovereign God, the eye-witness of all my past life, and the wise Disposer of all events; thou hast taken from me one who seemed almost necessary to my existence in comfort and virtue; thou hast left me alone with four children in the wilderness. I am exposed to temptation and sin—to the gloomy thoughts which rise up in solitude—and to pain and affliction, in which there will be no more my dear and tender-hearted friend to help and advise. Yet, thou knowest, I would not murmur—I would not overlook the numerous mitigations which thy providence has graciously afforded me in this affliction, by ordering the time of it when I am surrounded with kind friends. I would learn from it useful lessons, but ah! how weak are my wishes. Blessed Being, have pity on me, diffuse through my soul that spiritual life, health, and vigor, on which the existence and action of holiness depend; I fear I shall soon again forget even those feeble and ineffective resolutions which this dispensation of thine hand for the time excites. O, by thy healthful Spirit, produce lasting good in my soul, temper, and conduct, by it. May this event, which seems to strike so deep at the root of my temporal comfort be, through thy blessing, the commencement of a new era in the state of my spiritual feelings. May more delight in prayer, more savor of heavenly things, more relish for the Holy Scriptures, more comfort of mind in view of death and eternity, more care and diligence in the improvement of time, for my own edification and the instruction of others, more constant attention to the state of my heart, more pure regard to God and my Saviour, more feeling regard for the poor, distressed and afflicted, and a more dutiful attention to the state of my children, be the effects of this bereavement: then I shall not have cause, in eternity, to regret it; but rather to bless thee for it. O, let me not indulge even the thought of sin in my heart; let me not in an unguarded moment fall; fill my mind with a Christian abhorrence and indignation of all sin.

Help my mind to dwell with more pleasure on what is contained in these words; 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Ah! I find the heart needs *pulling* and *dragging* to this great and fundamental subject. It ought not to be so: It is not always so with thy chosen. Help, Lord, for I have no strength! May my future labors in the mission derive a tinge of seriousness, and carry in them deeper impressions of eternity, than before. O, that the event may prove that I have not been forsaken by thee, and that my beloved wife was not taken away in thine *anger* against me; but taken in mercy to her and to me from the evils of this world; and that I am only left behind for a little to be better prepared for meeting thee, my Judge, in death, and to be the means of some good in this world. Let these words of my lips, and meditations of my heart, come up before thee, O my God and my Redeemer."—pp. 221—223, *N. Y. edition.*

This extract evinces with what patience he submitted to the overwhelming calamity. But, however patiently he bore the stroke, yet it is probable that the blow greatly assisted in hurrying him to the grave. He survived the shock only about three years, during which time he abated in no respect his assiduity, but continued to labor with the same diligence as he did before his spirits were crushed by the loss of so endeared an object. He died at Malacca, June 2d, 1822, and was buried, on the same day, in a vault which he had built for the sepulture of his wife. "There," it is observed by his biographer, "There the body of that faithful and diligent servant of God shall remain, until the great day arrives when God shall judge the world in righteousness; and it is sincerely to be hoped that on that day, many of the poor heathen shall (will?) have (reason?) to bless God that ever Dr. Milne was sent to these (those?) parts."

We remarked, in the beginning of this article, that many of Mr. Philip's sentiments, respecting the subject of foreign missions, met with our cordial approbation. It is our intention to add a few reflections upon some of them, for the purpose of bringing them more distinctly before the notice of our readers. If we thereby aid the author in accomplishing the professed object of his book, to be "a guide to missionary spirit," we shall be abundantly rewarded.

Mr. Philip's views respecting the suitable qualifications of foreign missionaries, are evidently founded upon just observation. His language is, "Young men with more literature than piety, or with less grace than knowledge, have no more chance of passing the Missionary Board, than dolts and dreamers have of success. *Sticket* licentiates from the north may as much save themselves the trouble of applying to be missionaries, as *stupid* shopmen or mechanics in the south; for little *piety* and little *sense* are equally thrown over-board by all societies now. And who can wonder?" This paragraph is more adapted to the meridian of London, than of Boston; still it is the expression of an opinion in which we heartily concur. It certainly is not enough that a candidate for missionary labor possesses deep piety. To this should be joined a sound and vigorous intellect, disciplined by study, and enlightened by knowledge. Superadded to both, should be solidity of character, and strong common sense.

No conclusion is more false, than that if a man will not do for any place at home, he will answer for the missionary field. In general, if a man would fail at home, he would also fail abroad. We do not say that great genius is indispensable. But we do say that decided talent is highly desirable, provided it be consecrated talent. The foreign service is not the place for small men, either in piety, intellect or character. For it is our belief, that no other situation demands superior mental and moral qualities. How can this be otherwise? On whom do weightier responsibilities rest than upon missionaries? Whose virtue is assailed by severer or stronger temptations? The very atmosphere they are compelled to breathe is polluted by superstition, and all the exhalations of paganism. Whatever they touch is defiled. Surrounded by such deadly influences, the finest and purest properties of heart are needed. Nothing but gold will remain untarnished, when exposed to mephitic air. Besides, their business is to remodel the opinions, habits and sentiments of nations. They are reformers. What they do, and teach, and write, is to influence ages to come. How incalculable is the effect, either for good or evil, to be produced by a correct or an incorrect translation of the Scriptures! Laboring under such circumstances, no abilities can be too great, no knowledge too extensive.

On page 34 we find a proper stricture laid upon Mr. Milne's views respecting the employment of the missionary funds. These views are thus expressed: "As the money by which missionaries are supported is the fruit of the labor of the *poor*, and of the abundance of the rich, and as it is the property of the church of Christ, I shall always consider it a matter of conscience to use it sparingly." The author's comment upon this passage is contained in a quotation from Dr. Morrison, which is marked by his usual sound sense.

"This resolution is good, but it requires to be qualified and guarded. What money is for the *immediate furtherance of the GOSPEL* should not be used sparingly, in the publication and distribution of the Bible and good books; the best helps for acquiring a foreign language speedily and well; teachers, dictionaries, &c. And money that tends to the preservation of a missionary's health, by affording him wholesome and nutritious food and drink, and good air and lodging, and good medical aid, should not be spent grudgingly. Hard workers cannot be too well taken care of. Loungers, who study first their own ease and comfort,

do not deserve the same treatment. No means for the conversion of the nations, that reason and Scripture sanction, should be left untried, from an apprehension that the property will be used unsparingly. Let the property of the Christian public be faithfully, judiciously and liberally employed for the best causes. And let faithful missionaries be liberally supported. Call not their allowances charity, or alms. Alas, do they deserve nothing of their brethren but fine speeches and empty praises? What sacrifice does that disciple make, who **STAYS AT HOME** and gives a little of his money, in comparison of the disciple, who leaves father and mother, and sister and brother, and home, and gives **HIMSELF** to the work?"

The correctness of these opinions of Dr. Morrison must be seen by every reader. Grant that the missionary funds are procured in part from the poor; is this a reason why a missionary should be stinted in his means of living, and be deprived of "wholesome and nutritious food, good air and lodging, and good medical aid?" If we regarded only the interests of the enterprise, what a mistaken policy would it be, to curtail the enjoyments of the laborer in the foreign field, and multiply his deprivations, to such a degree as is inconsistent with sound health? With impaired health, what can he do? With a shattered constitution, to what would his study amount? But we do not look at the question merely as a matter of profit and loss to the Board. We regard the missionaries as our brethren. They deserve our kind care and liberal patronage. They should know it to be our wish that they should enjoy "wholesome and nutritious food," and that it gives none of us pleasure at home, to learn that any missionary is voluntarily depriving himself of reasonable enjoyments, and subjecting himself to fare inconsistent with health, out of a desire to use missionary money sparingly, because raised in part from the *poor*. We want economy, not parsimony.

While on this point, let us also say that we concur with Dr. Morrison in another of his opinions. He says, "Call not their allowance charity or alms." It is neither, and therefore ought not to receive such a name. We deprecate the influence upon a man's character, produced by the impression that he is supported by charity. The idea is repulsive to any man of proper independence. The salary of either minister or missionary is no more a charity, than the salary of any other man. We are aware that the precise relation existing between the missionary and the

Board—which is merely an organization, formed for the simple purpose of carrying into effect the wishes of the churches at home—cannot be easily defined. So far as this is possible, it has been done in a very able manner, by the Foreign Secretary of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. We refer to the instructions lately given by Mr. Peck to Messrs. Constantine and Fielding, missionaries to West Africa. They may be found in number 285 of the Baptist Magazine. In this paper, the relation of which we are speaking is explained in a manner extremely lucid, and in a style extremely simple and elegant. From the representations there made, it will be evident that so long as the Board deem it to be their duty “to provide for the suitable support” of those who are sent abroad, there can be no ground for supposing that the missionary lives upon charity. Our views on this point are in perfect harmony with those of Dr. Morrison. “Call not their allowance charity or alms. Alas! do they deserve nothing of their brethren but fine speeches and empty praises? What sacrifice does that disciple make, who STAYS AT HOME, and gives a little of his money, in comparison of the disciple, who leaves father, and mother, and sister, and brother, and home, and gives HIMSELF to the work?”

The description given by the author of the manner in which Dr. Morrison and Dr. Milne lived and labored together, forms the most interesting part of the book. It is a lovely picture, which may be studied with great advantage by every missionary, and, indeed, by every Christian. The intercourse of these two men with each other, evinces unequalled magnanimity, and moral greatness. Of this we find an example in the willingness of Dr. Morrison to receive Dr. Milne as a *partner* in the work of translating the Scriptures into the Chinese language. The former was a ripe scholar, and abundantly able to complete the work, by his own labors. Still, with a noble disinterestedness, he invited Dr. Milne to share with him in the honor and glory of the undertaking. This absence of all rivalry and jealousy between them was the “more creditable to the piety of both,” observes the author, “because the spirit of neither was unambitious, nor very accommodating. Each of them had to suppress a temperament, not easily kept under.” Grace must have

done a great deal for men, who, possessing "temperaments not easily kept under," yet exhibited to each other, without interruption, to the end of life, the most generous and confiding affection. That they did exhibit and feel all this, is placed beyond doubt by their correspondence. The lovely spirit of their intercourse is the more refreshing, on account of the frequency with which even Christians manifest a tartness and sourness of temper towards each other. Morrison and Milne have set us an example worthy of all imitation. Let us follow it at home, and let missionaries follow it abroad, and thereby see the beauty and realize the advantage of Christians' living "as heirs together of the grace of life."

The twenty-fourth chapter of this work is entitled, "A Voice from the Tombs of Morrison and Milne, to the Schools of the Prophets." In this chapter, the author has introduced many very important and solemn observations, upon the duty of every candidate for the ministry making it a serious question whether God calls him to labor among the heathen. We hope that this portion of the volume will be attentively read by all our young men of piety, who are in the course of preparation for the sacred office. They will find the subject honestly stated, and the principles by which the question ought to be settled, clearly unfolded. The importance and duty of this inquiry are not, we fear, adequately felt. Nor do we hesitate to say, that, however bold the following sentence may appear, yet it is abundantly warranted by Scripture. "It is, therefore, at his peril, that a man goes up to the altar as a minister, until he has fairly and fully met the question, What is my duty in this day of missions?"

We regret, however, to say, that the force of this chapter is in one or two places greatly lessened by a declamatory mode of writing, which invariably injures appeals to the conscience. Thus, the idea that a man, in deciding the question whether he shall be a missionary, ought to realize the presence of God, has much solemnity and force. The way, however, in which our author chooses to express this idea, may be learned from the following quotation. "Any one may skirt the confines of omniscience, or bear the question within the outer 'rings' of its heart-searching light, without ascertaining either the will of God, or the real bias of his own will." In our

view, the idea clothed with this verbiage loses all its power. The mind is diverted from the thought, and begins to speculate upon the probable meaning of such a collection of words. And, before the speculation is finished, the impression previously made on the conscience is gone. But such writing is not less effective upon the conscience, than it is displeasing to the taste. We might ask, with great propriety, what is meant by "skirting the confines of omniscience?" To us, the expression, "confines of omniscience," looks very like a contradiction in terms. Granting, however, that, by any allowable use of figures, omniscience have *confines*, we ask whether it is not imposing a rather adventurous task upon a person to make him *skirt* them? But hardly has this immense territory of omniscience begun to be "skirted," before omniscience is transformed into the planet Saturn, within the "outer rings" of which the question relative to a man's duty to be a missionary is "borne." Now, apart from the jumbling of metaphors, we ask, what idea can possibly be formed from such an expression as, "bearing the question within the outer rings of the light of omniscience?" Dr. Johnson, in his critical examination of Cowley, quotes the following stanza from Donne, at which he exclaims, "Confusion worse confounded!"

"Here lies a she sun, and a he moon here;  
She gives the best light to his sphere;  
Or each is both, and all, and so  
They unto one another nothing owe."

We submit whether the stanza of Donne is "confusion worse confounded" than the sentence quoted from Mr. Philip.

We have already extended this article farther than was at first contemplated, and shall therefore put a period here to our remarks. Our attention has been particularly attracted to the style of this author, from the fact that his emission of books is very frequent, and from noticing in the present volume that he expresses a "strong partiality for the pen," and plainly considers writing his special sphere of usefulness. How far this is true, we pretend not to say. But of one thing we feel morally certain; no man can long continue to be useful in writing, if his composition bear the marks of haste and carelessness that are every where observable in this book.

ARTICLE V.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS.

THE PRINCIPLES OF LEGAL EVIDENCE IN THEIR APPLICATION TO  
THE HISTORICAL PARTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The writers of the gospel history are to be regarded as witnesses who have furnished posterity with their solemn deposition respecting the facts which constitute the basis of the Christian faith. Indeed, they claim to be such witnesses. Taking it for granted, then, that the documents which contain this testimony have been transmitted to us *entire*, a fact which has been thoroughly discussed and satisfactorily proved, we have thought that it might be an interesting and profitable task to inquire, how far this testimony conforms to the principles of evidence as recognized in our highest courts of justice. With this view, we have selected "Starkie on Evidence," as furnishing an exposition of these principles, upon which we might rely as authoritative and satisfactory. In that work, we find the following *criteria* by which to determine the truth in regard to matters of fact. "The credit due to the testimony of witnesses depends upon, first, their *honesty*; secondly, their *ability*; thirdly, their *number* and the *consistency* of their testimony; fourthly, the *conformity* of their testimony to *experience*; and fifthly, the coincidence of their testimony with *collateral circumstances*."<sup>\*</sup>

We proceed, then, to remark, *in the first place, that the Christian witnesses were honest*. This is proved by the general and almost universally admitted excellence of their moral character. With the exception of a very limited number of persons, who have suffered a strong and inveterate prejudice to pervert all historical fact, none have ventured to deny the purity of the character of Christ and that of his immediate followers. Skeptics themselves have, in a majority of instances, been compelled to do honor to their moral excellence.

---

\* Vol. I. p. 479, Phil. edition.

That they were fully convinced of the facts which they narrate, cannot admit of a doubt, when we reflect upon the sufferings they endured in attestation of their testimony. Nor did these sufferings occur unexpectedly; they were fully anticipated and deliberately chosen. Of the facts upon which this assertion rests, not even the early opponents of Christianity ever presumed to express a doubt. Hierocles, Porphyry, Celsus, Julian, and the authors of the Jewish Talmud, all admit them. Indeed they were matters of general and undenial notoriety, to which friends and foes were accustomed to make frequent and familiar references.

Men act upon motives, and these in their general influence and results operate with perfect uniformity. No wicked man was ever systematically and perseveringly opposed to every species of vice. No impostor was ever *permanently* the friend of truth, purity and virtue. No villain, however consummate in hypocrisy, was ever uniformly the advocate of honor, integrity and benevolence. Especially, has no individual of this sort, ever voluntarily assumed sacrifice and suffering, subjected himself to persecution, poverty and death, for the promotion of purposes at once pure and beneficent. For even, on the supposition of its being an imposture, "it is," to quote the language of Bolingbroke, a professed infidel, "one of the most benevolent that was ever imposed upon mankind for their good." While an impostor may act *occasionally* like an honest man, he cannot do so uniformly and permanently. He has some personal object to gain, and that must be accomplished at all hazards, and by all means. The welfare of his fellow-creatures, if desired at all, is a secondary consideration; his own aggrandizement, or that of his party supplies the dominant impulse. Such a one, whatever his pretensions, is a villain at heart, and will never suffer destitution, shame and death for the benefit of others. Who, then, with the facts of the case before him, will venture to say that the Christian witnesses were impostors, hypocrites and liars? Did they seek wealth? They were poorer than the poorest. Fame? They were accounted the off-scouring of all things. Ease? They were driven from their homes and their kindred, they wandered over the world, in labor and sorrow, being "destitute, afflicted, tormented."

Political influence? They renounced the policies of this world, and derived all their immunities from heaven. If, then, it was nothing in this world, was it any thing in the world to come, which formed their inducement? Was it, for example, a crown of glory which should never fade away? If impostors, they must, upon their own principles, have lost it and sunk to perdition for ever. The life of the apostle Paul supplies a fine illustration of this matter. He might have risen to the highest offices in the Jewish commonwealth, acquired property, and received the homage of the learned and the powerful. But he renounced it all, became an outcast from his nation, and a persecuted follower of the despised Nazarene. Like his great Master, he had not where to lay his head, and endured an amount of suffering which would have prostrated any common man. His labors and sacrifices were immense. In all these, painful as they must have been, he was upheld by the consciousness of integrity. To the end of his life did he maintain the same unbending fortitude, and at last sealed his testimony with his blood.

Several of the other apostles and immediate followers of Christ were cut off by cruel and ignominous deaths, and all of them lived in constant expectation of such a death. In this way Christianity received the most solemn and affecting ratification which could be given it by mortals.

We admit at once that the sufferings and death of an individual on the behalf of his religion will not prove it true; but it most certainly proves *him* disinterested and honest. But there is a peculiarity in this department of the Christian evidence which deserves special attention. It is, that the sufferings of the witnesses not only prove them disinterested, but worthy of credit. They suffered, not for *opinions*, but for *facts*. That they were mistaken as to the occurrence of these facts, cannot be conceived, as we shall subsequently more fully show. Men may die for doctrines and opinions that are false, but not for *facts*, things which can be seen, heard, or felt, and which occurred in such circumstances as to admit of no deception or mistake.

Another argument for the honesty of the Christian witnesses, is derived from the perfect morality they every where inculcate in their writings, and the frank and

ingenuous manner in which they speak of their own faults and imperfections. They refer to their humble origin, their ignorance, their foibles and mistakes, in a manner so artless and interesting as to give the impression not only of sincerity, but of uncommon and scrupulous honesty.

Had the writers of the New Testament, then, been in any respect guilty of imposture, the fact would have discovered itself in some part of their moral system. Here we should have found some equivocal principle taught and commended, under which they might have screened themselves in their attempt to impose their religious views upon the world. The probability of this is rendered still greater, by the prevalence, during the apostolic age, of false and imperfect systems of morals among the Jews and the neighboring nations. It was a time of great ignorance upon the subject of morals and religion, as well as of universal depravity of manners. It would have been impossible at such a time for impostors to originate and sustain a perfect system of morals. Their own personal virtue being defective, and all their thoughts and feelings modified by the action of a monstrous and long-sustained imposition, how could they excogitate, above all, how could they teach and defend such a system of ethics? And even were this possible, how could they live for it, suffer for it, die for it? It would condemn themselves, and remain an eternal monument of their disgrace. Hence we conclude, that a supposition of this kind is incredible in the highest degree.

In estimating the value of testimony, we uniformly regard the spirit and manner in which it is given. When it is presented in a confused and imperfect manner, and with much appearance of prejudice and passion, a suspicion is immediately created that it is either distorted or false. On the other hand, when it is given in a clear, full, and dispassionate manner, it carries with it an evidence of its credibility. But we find the entire testimony of the Christian witnesses presented in a manner the most free from embarrassment, prejudice and passion, that can be conceived. Every thing is related in the simple, straightforward language of truth. There is no bespeaking the reader's attention, no attempts to catch admiration and to produce effect, no confusion or embar-

rassment, no explanation of things difficult or strange, no expressions of wonder at their own marvellous relations, no exaggeration, no special effort. All is calm, clear, consistent throughout. Facts of the most wonderful and appalling nature are stated without an expression of personal feeling, of love or hatred, of admiration or contempt; just as if they felt themselves arraigned before the highest judicial tribunal, and under oath, to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The death of Christ, his agonies, the bitter hatred of his enemies, the treachery of Judas, the desertion of Peter, the taunt and scorn of the high priests, and the demoniac rage of the crowd, all pass in review without a single note of horror or surprise. Amid the most exciting narratives, they maintain a quiet and dignified self-possession,—the natural manner of conscious rectitude. The truth is, they were not only narrating facts well known to all, facts which could not be doubted or disbelieved, but they felt they were uttering before the world a solemn testimony upon the great subject of Christianity. They had themselves become perfectly familiar with the stupendous facts of the gospel history, and conscious of the lofty position which they occupied as witnesses to the truth, and intent only on fulfilling their great mission, they did not indulge in the expression of personal feeling, but uttered their testimony in the noble simplicity of well assured conviction. They felt that it would have been impertinent to mingle their own feelings in a matter of such sublime importance; indeed their own feelings were lost in the higher interest of Christ and his cross. "Their whole soul was occupied with one object which predominated over all the means subservient to it, however great those means might be. In the storm, the pilot's eye is fixed upon the head-land that must be weathered; in the crisis of victory or defeat, the general sees only the position to be carried, and the dead and the instruments of death fall around him unheeded. On the salvation of men, on this one point, the witnesses of Christ and the ministers of the Spirit expended all their energy of feeling and expression. All that occurred, mischance, persecution and miracle, were glanced at by the eye of faith only in subserviency to the mark of the prize of their high calling, as working together for good, and all exempt from the associations

which would attach to such events and scenes when contemplated by themselves and with the short-sightedness of uninspired men. Miracles were not to them objects of wonder, nor mischance a subject of sorrow and lamentation. They did all and suffered all to the glory of God.”\*

In the *second place*, *they were not only honest but competent.* “The competence or ability of a witness to speak the truth,” says the eminent jurist already quoted, “must depend upon the opportunities which he has had for observing the fact, the accuracy of his powers of discerning, and the faithfulness of his memory in retaining the facts when observed and known.”

The Christian witnesses had ample means of becoming acquainted with the facts to which they testify. They mingled in the scenes they describe, and had personal experience of the facts they narrate. The principal writers of the New Testament, Matthew, John, Peter, James and Jude, were immediate followers of Christ, and eye-witnesses of his miracles and of the astonishing effects produced by them upon the people. Paul, though a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, had resided in Jerusalem, and must have been personally acquainted with the principal facts of the gospel history. He, too, had seen the risen Saviour, performed miracles in his name, and witnessed the glorious effects of a preached gospel. Mark, according to the testimony of all antiquity, composed his narrative under the immediate direction of the apostle Peter, and Luke under that of Paul. The histories of Mark and Luke thus possess all the value and authority which attach to those of original witnesses. Well has it been remarked, that no history since the beginning of the world has been written by so great a number of contemporary authors. Indeed, we regard some histories as authentic and true, the written documents of which belong to an age subsequent to that in which the events they narrate transpired. This is the case with the histories of Alexander the Great, of Augustus, Tiberius Cæsar, and others which were written by authors who were not contemporary with the facts they narrate.

---

\* Quoted in the Appendix to Whately's Rhetoric.

The writers of the New Testament were perfectly competent to form an estimate of the nature and bearing of the facts to which they testify. They were not men of weak and enthusiastic minds, but of sober and rational views. Look at the manner in which they give their testimony. Does it betray marks of ignorance or imbecility? Have not infidels themselves confessed that the gospel narratives possess inimitable simplicity and power? Apart even from all considerations of their authenticity and truth, will it not be admitted, that the system contained in the sacred books indicates great mental vigor and wisdom? Suppose them an imposture, what evidence, we would ask, is furnished by the invention and successful establishment of the religious system which they inculcate, as to the intellectual character of their authors? It will be granted, that the design of a universal religion, to supersede all others, and be perpetuated to the end of time, was unspeakably grand. It will also be admitted, that the means made use of to establish this religion were admirably adapted to their purpose, and the mode of its execution daring and vigorous beyond a parallel. It will not be denied, that the conception of our Saviour's character is infinitely superior to any thing in the annals of literary history. Incarnate wisdom might have furnished the model, and the hand of an angel sketched the picture. If, then, all this is to be referred to the unassisted powers of the Christian witnesses, they must have been men, not only of the highest intellect, but of the most marvellous sagacity, the most comprehensive views. They must have possessed an energy of character altogether irresistible, associated with a wisdom so refined and far-reaching as at once to grasp and control all the elements of civil society. Hence, if they were impostors, we must regard them as the greatest, the wisest, the most profound impostors the world ever saw. How any sane man can entertain such a notion in regard to the illiterate and simple-hearted fishermen of Galilee, is to us inconceivable.

It is evident that nothing but the credibility of the gospel history can account for the facts to which we have referred. The life of Christ, the doctrines of the gospel, the institutions and morals of Christianity, and indeed every thing which appertains to the system, must have been supplied as matters of real history to the writers of

the sacred narratives. To invent them, even had they been so disposed, was utterly beyond their power. The very nature and character of their testimony proves them competent.

It may be worth while, in this connection, further to observe, that the writers of the New Testament did not form their opinions, or proceed to give their testimony, without ample consideration, and in some cases without great hesitation and reluctance. Till better informed and fully convinced in their own minds, their fault appeared to lie, not in believing too much, but in believing too little. Neither did they compose their narratives without great care, and the most assured conviction of their truth. Hence the well known language of Luke\* and of John.†

That their memory was faithful in retaining the facts of their testimony, cannot surely admit of a doubt. The Gospel of Matthew was written only a few years after the resurrection of Christ; the others in the course of thirty or forty years after that event. The Gospel of John was the latest, and that was composed near the close of the first century. The Acts of the Apostles were probably written at the time in which the events narrated therein transpired, as was also the case with the other narratives found in various other parts of the apostolic epistles. Does a man forget the principal events of his past life; does he forget those especially which have changed the whole current of his thoughts, feelings and actions; and would a narrative of such events be deemed incredible, though composed at any subsequent period of his life? If this cannot be the case, then are the writers of the gospel narratives worthy of implicit credence.

Thirdly. *The number of the witnesses was adequate, and more than adequate.* If testimony is given in a court of justice by two or three witnesses of honesty and competence, more especially if no counter testimony is produced, every jury must be satisfied of its truth. But here are eight witnesses of this description, who bear their testimony to the facts of the gospel history. To their deposition, there appears no counter testimony. Their enemies admit the facts; at least, they do not deny them. The clumsy fabrication produced by the Jewish Sanhe-

\* Luke 1: 1.

† 1 John 1: 1—3.

dram to account for the resurrection does not deserve a moment's notice. A child might detect its crude inconsistency. Indeed, it may be regarded as a tacit admission, and a consequent proof of the fact which it seeks to invalidate.

It is also worthy of remark, that the Christian witnesses appeal to hundreds and thousands in Judea and in other places as to the truth of their testimony; and it appears these persons never called in question the declarations that were made. Thus we have the indirect evidence of whole communities to the truth of the sacred records.

Their testimony is also *consistent*. The witnesses agree in all essential particulars, and they never contradict themselves. The authors of the gospel history obviously write without suspicion, without effort and study, and in perfectly good faith. From their very discrepancies (in form, not in substance), it is clear that they did not consult each other's narratives in order to an adjustment of their contents, and that they did not write for the purpose of corroborating each other's statements. The character of their narratives is, "*substantial truth under circumstantial variety.*" Research and study have explained the discrepancies to the satisfaction of all candid minds, while a great number of latent, undesigned and beautiful coincidences have been discovered which no possible ingenuity could have invented. So that the testimony of the witnesses remains entire, consistent and credible.

Fourthly. *Their testimony is conformable to experience.* Mr. Hume, followed by some other infidels, has maintained the contrary, and as a conclusion to his argument upon this subject, has assumed the monstrous position, that no amount of testimony can prove a miracle. He maintains that miracles are contrary to our uniform experience, which is nothing less than an assumption of the point at issue; because, if the eight honest and competent witnesses, whose character and claims we have discussed, have actually witnessed miraculous events, then such events are not contrary to experience. They may not have come under the cognizance of our individual observation, or of any persons in modern times, but if they have come within the experience of any honest and competent witnesses, who testify to the facts, then they are proved

by this very circumstance to be conformable to experience. No event can be contrary to the experience of one individual or any number of individuals, simply because they may never have witnessed any such event; for if this were the case, every thing new and strange, that has not come within the range of our own observation or experience, must be rejected as false. On this ground, we must reject all discoveries of new and untried powers of nature, till we can bring them to the test of our own limited experience. The development of new metals by the galvanic battery, the new and strange discoveries of geological science, the petrified and imbedded remains of an ancient and peculiar order of things, must all be rejected, because they are not conformable to our experience.\* True, we ought not to credit such discoveries till they are fully attested by competent witnesses; but this is all we claim for miracles. The only question to be settled in regard to them is, have they been established by adequate testimony?

Experience has established certain laws of conduct that are as uniform and constant in their operation as the laws of the physical world. "That a man," says our authority upon this subject, "will consult his own preservation, and serve his own interests; that he will prefer pleasure to pain, and gain to loss; that he will not commit a crime to endanger his person or property without a motive, and conversely, if he hath done such an act that he had a motive for doing it, are principles of action and conduct so clear, that they may properly be regarded as axioms in the theory of evidence."† Hence, it may be regarded as a fact, attested by all experience, that honest and competent witnesses will speak the truth. It is conformable to all our experience of the human family, that a number of sensible and worthy men, who had full opportunities of ascertaining a fact, and no conceivable motive to speak any thing but the truth, should by their testimony establish the reality of such a fact. Above all, it is inconsistent with our experience upon this subject, that eight virtuous men should suffer and die for what they know to be a falsehood. In one word, *it is more consistent with our experience, to believe that Christianity is true, than to believe that it is false.*

\* Mr. Starkie urges this argument with much force in a note upon this subject. Vol. I, p. 489.

† Vol. I, p. 499.

The conditions under which miraculous events take place, affect their credibility. Hence, while sufficient evidence will prove the reality of a miracle in any circumstances, it is more natural and easy for us to credit miraculous interposition in a case wherein it would be reasonable to expect it, and where such interposition is obviously designed to subserve some great and worthy purpose. This condition is fulfilled in the case of the Christian miracles, and especially in that of the resurrection of Christ. Let us describe the circumstances in which this great event occurred. The world by wisdom knew not God, and mankind were departing farther and farther from truth and purity. Darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people. A crisis had arrived in the affairs of man; and it appeared highly necessary and important, that the Divine Being should interpose for the benefit of his creatures. A long train of events had seemed to prepare the way for a distinguished and glorious revolution, and some intimations had been given of its approach. The advent of a divine messenger had been predicted in certain ancient books, and a general expectation of this event had for some time prevailed, not only in Palestine, but all over the Oriental world. A person claiming the character to which we have referred, makes his appearance. His aspect and manners correspond to the idea of "a teacher sent from God." He speaks on the subject of religion and morals, of life and immortality, as man had never before spoken; he rises infinitely above his contemporaries, and supplies in his own character a splendid illustration of the principles of purity and virtue. He performs many wonderful works, and suffers much from the persecution of the ungodly. He speaks of death, inflicted by others, as the necessary completion of his course; and looks forward to it, with a sublime and mysterious confidence. He finally dies by the hand of the public executioner, praying for his enemies, and exclaiming, *It is finished!* But previous to this, he had not only told his followers that he should die, but that he should rise again on the third day, and that all this was absolutely necessary to the accomplishment of his mission on earth, and the confirmation of his claims as a divinely commissioned teacher. They, however, are incredulous of the fact, and give up all for lost. His

enemies, being aware of his prediction, make his sepulchre sure, and seal it with the seal of the government. They also appoint a guard of Roman soldiers, to watch it by day and night. But on the third day, the sepulchre is found empty—the body of Jesus is gone. He appears to some of his disciples, then to the apostles: converses with them, and eats with them, and that not once but frequently. Some of them, at first, doubt, but they obtain ocular demonstration of the fact, so that all become perfectly certain of his resurrection. At least, such is the burden of their testimony; a testimony which they bear before the judicial tribunals and people of the Jews, and which they repeat to the day of their death, notwithstanding every variety of persecution, to which, in consequence of this testimony, they were subjected. Here, all must perceive, every thing is natural, consistent, satisfactory. The occasion is a great one—the greatest that can be conceived. Divine interposition seems highly appropriate. The miracle is natural and dignified; and thus, when the full and honest-hearted testimony of the witnesses is given, we have no difficulty in yielding it our implicit credence. He who can reject it, simply because it is a miracle, can reject any thing, however well established, that comes into competition with his preconceived notions, and philosophical dreams.

In the *fifth* and *last* place, *their testimony is corroborated by collateral circumstances, in other words, by collateral evidence.* This department of proof is very extensive and elaborate. It embraces a consideration of the natural and civil history of the times in which the witnesses lived; the progress of Christianity; its influence upon Judaism and idolatry; the changes which it wrought in the character of individuals and communities; the commemorative rites of the Christian faith; the numerous and minute coincidences between facts, names, dates and allusions in the Christian records, to the civil and political institutions, manners, customs and languages of the Jews and the neighboring nations; the testimonies of profane writers to many of the facts of the gospel history; the admissions of heretics, apostates and enemies; and the evidence supplied by ancient coins, medals and marbles. But the limits and design of this essay will not permit us even to touch upon the discussion of these points.

On the review of the whole, we may be permitted to say, that the credibility of the Gospel history is confirmed by all the evidence which the case admits; that the proof is not only satisfactory, but peculiarly and abundantly so; and that our faith consequently rests upon a foundation at once broad, and deep, and eternal. T.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### CONNECTION OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE WITH THE CAUSE OF LEARNING.\*

By the Rev. ENOCH POND, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

The subject of this paper is, *the connection of the missionary enterprise with the cause of science and literature throughout the world*; or, *the influence which the former of these causes has exerted, and may be expected to exert, upon the latter*.

Were I disposed to make the most of this subject, I might call attention, first of all, to the labors of the *primitive Christian missionaries*,—the apostles, and their successors for the next four hundred years,—who not only traversed the vast Roman empire, embodying, at that period, all the civilized portions of the earth, but who penetrated, on every side, the surrounding regions of darkness and barbarism, carrying with them the lights and consolations of religion, and also the lesser lights of *learning* and *science*. The staid and mystic Oriental, the untutored African, and the rude barbarians of northern Europe, including our own indomitable ancestors, were first taught the use of *letters*, as well as brought under the humanizing influence of Christianity, by the labors of missionaries.

I might also refer to the *Nestorian missionaries* of the middle ages, who penetrated the wide fields of Central Asia, from the uttermost bounds of China, to the Euphrates and

---

\* The substance of the following article was delivered as an address, on two public occasions. This will account for the direct and popular style in which some parts of it are written.

the Caspian Sea, softening the hearts of the fierce natives, and enriching their minds, with the rudiments of *learning*, and the elements of holy truth. It was through this region of country, that the celebrated Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, passed, in his excursion to the distant East. It was the Nestorian churches, chiefly, that he visited and described. And the fact that, by some, his narrative has been regarded as little better than romance, was more owing to the ignorance of the reader, than to a want of competency or fidelity in the writer.

I might refer, also, to the *Romish missionaries* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For whatever may be thought as to the results of their labors in a religious point of view, I am persuaded that, in a *literary* view, full justice has not been meted to them. The principal scene of their labors was southern and eastern Asia, some part of Africa, Mexico, and South America; and it is not too much to say, that nearly all the accurate knowledge of these great countries which the world possessed, until within the last fifty years, was derived from these men. The publications of the French missionaries alone amounted to half a hundred large volumes, all of which were read with avidity, not only by the friends of religion, but by the ablest scholars in Europe. The ancient maps of the interior provinces of China and Cochin-China, of the greater Tartary, Thibet, and Japan, were constructed almost entirely by the Jesuits, and other papal missionaries. The earliest accounts of Congo and Abyssinia were from the same source, and served as a guide to Mr. Bruce, in his subsequent travels through those countries. The Jesuits in South America explored and described vast regions, which had never before been visited by any European. One of these men wrote a history of the New World, of which Dr. Robertson says, "It contains more accurate observations, and more sound science, than are to be found in any description of remote countries published in that age." Another of them left a manuscript history of St. Domingo, which was the basis of the work of Charlesvoix.

But it is not my intention to enlarge on the writings of these missionaries of a former age, or on the indebtedness of the literary world to their labors. I choose rather to call attention to the *modern* missionary enterprise,—that which commenced among Protestants near the beginning

of the present century, and is still prosecuted with so much vigor and success. That there is an important connection between *this* great enterprise and the general cause of *learning* and *science*, so that the devotees of the latter have much to expect from the continued progress of the former, and consequently should feel a deep interest in it, is to my own mind exceedingly obvious; and it will be my endeavor so to present the subject, as to make it obvious to others.

What then, *is* the missionary enterprise? What is involved in it? In what may it be said mainly and most essentially to consist?

Those engaged in this work have undertaken to extend the Christian religion throughout the length and breadth of the earth. They have undertaken,—in literal obedience to the command of Christ,—to “preach the gospel to every creature.” In prosecuting this grand design, they are engaged,—so fast as men and means can be furnished,—in sending forth missionaries into all lands;—to the East and the West, the North and the South,—to countries civilized and uncivilized, near and remote,—to regions long inhabited, and to the newly discovered islands of the sea. The whole earth is to be visited and explored, and the blessings of civilization and the gospel are to be extended to all people.

And who are *the men* employed in this mighty enterprise? Not the ignorant and inefficient,—dunces, who could do nothing at home, and from whom enlightened Christian society is very willing to relieve itself. The men sent out are, in the first place, *educated* men;—men who, with few exceptions, have been *liberally, thoroughly* educated;—men who have enjoyed the best advantages which the universities and seminaries of Christendom can boast.

Then they are, in general, men of peculiar and distinguished *talents*,—men capable of looking closely at subjects presented,—of directing to a great extent, their own studies and movements,—of pursuing successfully the most arduous literary as well as spiritual labors,—of grappling effectually with whatever difficulties or opposition may be thrown in their way. It would be vain, on such an errand, to send forth other men than these; and these, in general are *the men*, whom the directors of mod-

ern missions have sought out, and actually sent out, into the service. If any doubt this, let them run their eye over the catalogue of missionaries, who have gone forth from the different churches of England and America, during the last forty years. There he may read the honored names of Buchanan, and Martyn, and Morrison, and Milne, and Carey, and Marshman, and Ward, and Hall, among the departed. He may read, also, the no less honored names of Judson,\* and Poor, and Scudder, and King, and Robertson, and Phillips, and Bingham, and Thurston, among the living. I might mention a great many others, of perhaps equal ability,—*turmae nobilissimae juvenum*,—who have more recently entered the field of their labors. Among these are to be found not only clergymen, but physicians, printers, artisans, agriculturists, and others, from the different walks of life. They are, in general, men who had the best prospects before them in their native lands; and who, by their talents and learning, their intellectual ability and moral worth, are capable of making their influence felt, and themselves respected, any where.

And these men are sent forth into different parts of the earth, it must be borne in mind, not as tourists, or envoys, or diplomatists, to hurry over a country or continent, note first impressions, and come home and publish them as

---

\* I am happy in the opportunity thus afforded me, of paying what I conceive to be a merited tribute to the high missionary character of Dr. Judson. It will be recollectcd, by many who read this article, that soon after his change of sentiments, and the publication of his sermon on the subject of Baptism, I published a reply to the sermon, in the introduction to which some things were said, impeaching the motives of Dr. J., and implicating, to some extent, his Christian character. In the statements there made, I had the concurrence of the then members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and of most of the Congregational ministers and Christians of that day. But in view of the course since pursued by Dr. J., his labors and sufferings, his zeal, his constancy, his well-directed and successful efforts in the best of causes; and especially, after the explanations he has made of some things which, at the time of his change, were regarded by many as mysterious, I think no one can question the purity of his motives, or the distinguished excellence and devotedness of his Christian character. From the later editions of my work on Baptism, I have expunged every thing which could be interpreted as disreputable to Dr. J. I have long followed him, in what I have known of his studies and labors, with deep interest, and regard him as entitled to stand among the foremost of living missionaries.

veritable truths; but they are sent, each to his particular field of labor, which is henceforward to become his *home*. He is to *remain* there,—to spend his *life* there. He is to associate familiarly with the people; study their dispositions and character; acquaint himself with their peculiar customs and manners; learn their language; read their books, if they have any; traverse their country, so far as he shall have occasion; search into their antiquities, mythology and history; and while he is endeavoring to do them good, is to make himself acquainted (as manifestly he ought to do) with every thing of interest respecting them. And now I ask, is it possible that men thus situated, and of the character above described, should not make numerous and important discoveries, in the different departments of *science* and *learning*? Is it possible that they should not have it in their power,—being in constant communication with their patrons at home,—to make continual and large accessions to that general fund of *knowledge*, which belongs appropriately to the world?

One of the most important branches of human learning is *philology*. Ever since the confusion of tongues at Babel, and the consequent separation of the tribes of men, a necessity has been imposed on those who would become learned, or who would associate extensively with mankind, to acquire different languages. And the study of languages has constituted no small part of the mental labor of our race. This being the case, every new fact which is discovered in the history of language,—every new principle which is unfolded and established,—every additional *facility* in this branch of study,—in short, every accession which is made to the general stock of linguistic lore,—should be regarded as so much gained to the cause of learning, and to the interests and happiness of man. And who, I ask, are in more favorable circumstances for promoting these important objects, than missionaries? And who have done more than they, for their actual advancement?

When a missionary plants himself among a people, his first effort is to acquire their language. And this he must do, not superficially, but *thoroughly*,—so that he shall be able, not only to read their books (if they have any) but to converse with them freely, and address them intelligibly. If their language is an unwritten one, like those of the aborigines of this country, and of the islanders in the

Pacific and Indian oceans, he first forms his lists of words, as caught by the ear; reduces them to order and rule; establishes his system of orthography; constructs his lexicon and grammar; and by the time he is able to converse familiarly with the people, he has constructed for them, and for the world, a written language. The work performed in this case is not only an acquisition to himself, and to those for whose special benefit it was intended, it is, I repeat, an acquisition to *the world*. It is so much clear gain to the great republic of letters. And how often has this work been accomplished, and this gain been realized, within the last fifty years, through the instrumentality of Christian missionaries? I may even go further, and ask, *when*,—*where*,—has this work been accomplished at all, in modern times, except through their instrumentality? Commerce has not done it. Neither literary interest, nor governmental influence, has ever done it. But Christian missionaries have done it, I had almost said, a hundred times over. And are these devoted men entitled to no credit, on this behalf, from the learned world? Did Cadmus immortalize his name, by introducing letters into Greece, and instructing the rude natives in their use? And shall no honor be given, and no obligation be felt, to those in our own age, who have done the same thing, and done it on a far wider scale than was ever attempted before? who have taught *various* heathen tribes, in the west and south of Africa, in different parts of Asia, in our own forests, and in the islands of the sea, the use of letters, and are now engaged in preparing books, and creating for them a literature of their own?

The *incidental* advantages of a labor such as this to the cause of learning, are scarcely less important than its direct results. In the work of shaping an unformed language, studying it in its elements, and committing it to writing, new and important *facts* will be likely to be discovered, and principles before unknown may be deduced. And not only so, affinities in language may be traced, and the origin of nations thereby discovered, which otherwise must have remained concealed. It was in this way, that the track of our own English ancestors was traced, at the distance of some three or four thousand years, to the neighborhood of the Caucasian mountains, and the Black and Caspian seas.

The following questions have long been agitated among the learned. Whence came the aborigines of America to this country? And whence the numerous and populous tribes, inhabiting the green isles of the Western ocean? The time for a full and satisfactory answer to these questions has, probably, not yet come. But I predict that, whenever they are answered, the result will be owing, in no small degree, to the discoveries of missionaries, in tracing out affinities in language, and comparing the customs and features, the domestic habits and religious rites of different nations.

But the missionary, in many instances, is not under the necessity of shaping a language for his people; he finds one written to his hand,—it may be a venerable language, like the Arabic, the Sanscrit, and Chinese. In this case, as before, his first labor is to acquire the language,—to acquire it *thoroughly*,—that he may be able, not only to use it in common conversation, but to consult libraries, read books, and possess himself of whatever learning may be treasured in it. This many Christian missionaries have already done; and having done it, they obviously possess the means, beyond almost any others, of promoting the literary interests of the world. Take, for example, the missionaries in Syria, who have made themselves familiar with the Arabic tongue. This language is remarkable, not only for its great age, for the beauty and finish of its structure, and for the wide extent to which it is spoken, but for the *literary* treasures which are supposed to be hoarded and buried under it. It is a singular fact, that, in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Christian era,—the very midnight of the dark ages, when the lights of learning and science seemed, in all other countries, ready to expire,—they blazed up, with a steady and glowing resplendence, in Arabia, and the surrounding regions. Under the patronage of the Caliphs, learned men were here drawn together, extensive libraries were collected, schools were established, the best works of the Greeks were translated into the Arabic tongue, and no means were neglected, and no expense spared, which would be likely to conduce to the advancement of learning. The consequence was, that the literati of Arabia became, in a short time, the most celebrated in the world. For several centuries, they were the depositaries of learning;

and became, subsequently, the instructors of Europe. Many of the Arabic works prepared at that period have since been translated; some have been destroyed; but others, it is with good reason believed, remain concealed. They are treasured up in palaces and castles, in public and private libraries, in different Mohammedan countries, and need but the search of qualified Arabic scholars, to bring them again before the world. And who so likely to make this search,—to make it diligently and effectually,—as missionaries residing in those countries;—men who are acquainted with the manners and customs of the people, possess their confidence, and are able to read their language with the same facility as their own? I know not but I am enthusiastic on this point; but I cannot resist the impression, that students and antiquaries have yet much to hope from the inquiries of missionaries,—inquiries made without at all interfering with the appropriate duties of these men,—in search of hidden, buried remains of Arabic learning.

The dependence of letters on the missionary work may be strongly illustrated, by considering what has been done in reference to China. It is but a few years since the celestial empire, embodying more than a third of the population of the globe, was to the rest of the world little better than a *terra incognita*;—enclosed as it was by the double wall of commercial restrictions, and its invincible, unreadable language. The latter of these walls has been, in great measure, broken down, and taken out of the way; and that, too, by the labor of missionaries. In the year 1807, the celebrated Morrison entered on his mission to China. After a residence of four years, he completed a grammar of the language. In eleven years more, he had prepared and printed, at an expense of £12,000, a complete Chinese and English dictionary, in six quarto volumes. Meanwhile, Dr. Marshman, at Serampore, was laboring in the same cause, where he translated, I believe, the entire works of Confucius. By these, and other consequent means, the barrier-door, excluding all intercourse between the celestial empire and those who speak the English language, has been fairly thrown open. The Chinese is now made as accessible, and is almost as easy of acquisition, as any other language. Americans visiting that country may soon be able to converse with the China-man in his own tongue, and he with them in theirs.

Of the importance of a literary achievement, like that of Morrison above described, we are scarcely able to conceive. When we think of the extent of the Chinese empire, of the swarming millions of its population, of the commercial interests connected with it, and of the value of an unrestricted social intercourse between it and Protestant Christian nations; the work to which I have referred, considered only in a *literary* point of view, swells to an importance, of which I know not how worthily to speak. Compared with it, of how little value are the light, ephemeral effusions of our tale-tellers and fiction-mongers, who would fain be regarded as *par excellence*, the literati of England and America!

I have spoken of the labor bestowed upon the language of China, because of the vast interests which are likely to be affected by it, and not because the work itself is greater than that performed in some other places. Indeed, it is by no means so great. The American missionaries have prepared dictionaries, vocabularies and grammars of several heathen languages. Dr. Judson has prepared and published a very valuable Lexicon of the Burmese. Dr. Carey, an English Baptist missionary, published grammars of no less than eight languages, and a dictionary of one. In the establishment at Serampore,—in addition to much that was *purely literary*,—the holy Scriptures were in the process of translation and publication in from twenty to thirty languages at the same time.

Some persons, I know, will think lightly of undertakings such as this, because they are confined so exclusively to the Bible. But has the Bible, I ask, no *literary* merit? Setting it aside (if it must be so) as a book of religion, is it not itself a *literary production*; and one that will more than bear comparison with the best of Greece and Rome? Does it not "contain history, and poetry, and eloquence,—eloquence, without the fires of ambition or party; poetry, without the alloy of a cumbrous and debasing mythology; history, without the ornaments and falsehoods of national partiality?" And is it of no importance, in a *literary* view, to give this volume to the nations? Who can estimate the *literary* influence and importance of Luther's Bible in Germany; or of our own invaluable translation of the Scriptures in England and America? But what these translations have done for us, the translations now

making and giving to the heathen will in due time effect for them. They will not only open to them the blessings of salvation, but will be a perpetual source of interest and profit to them, as citizens, as scholars, and as men.

That I may not be thought to stand alone, in my estimate of the literary labors of missionaries in the East, I must be permitted to refer to the editors of the London Quarterly Review. In the first nineteen volumes of this great critical work, there are no less than fourteen extended articles, occasioned by missionary publications. The reviewers speak of the missionaries in the East as "learned and indefatigable scholars," whose "progress in the Oriental languages is wonderful," and to whom "the European world is indebted, in no small degree, for the extension of its knowledge of Oriental literature." "The Clavis Sinica of Dr. Marshman, and the Dictionary of Dr. Morrison," they say, "are two of the most acceptable volumes that the study of Asiatic literature has yet produced. They have completely torn away the veil that so long enveloped the symbolic writing of the Chinese, and removed the difficulty that has hitherto impeded the study of that singular language." In short, the reviewers represent these missionaries as having "a claim to the thanks of the literary part of the world;" and as being "the benefactors of the human race." I quote here the language of these reviewers, because, having little sympathy, whether political or religious, with the missionaries, they were led to bestow the meed of their praise, from a pure sense of literary justice.

But the labors of missionaries are not to be estimated alone by their success in mastering difficult languages. At all the principal stations, the *press* is in operation, pouring forth its treasures for the benefit of all concerned;—furnishing a new and purified literature to the people immediately interested, and bringing forth whatever of interest may have been concealed among them, for the benefit of the world.

Nor is this all; at most of the principal stations, there are established not only schools, but *high schools*, *colleges* and *seminaries of learning*, designed to furnish to the more promising youth the advantages of a liberal education. Such a college was founded by Dr. Morrison at Malacca. Several of a like character have been established in Bengal.

Others are founded in Burmah, Ceylon, Constantinople, and in the Sandwich and Society Islands. Here all are the results of missionary labor, and in general are superintended by missionaries themselves. Of their present and prospective *literary* importance, I need not speak. Calculate, if you can, the importance, in a literary view, of almost any of the colleges of New England. But what these colleges have been, and are, to the youth of our country, the colleges established by missionaries in heathen lands will be to the teeming myriads who surround them. These institutions, though yet in their infancy, have begun to scatter wide their blessings; and they will continue to scatter them, with a broader cast, and a more liberal hand, till science, learning and religion shall have completed their joint conquest over the darkness and superstitions of men.

But the missionary enterprise has *other* connections with learning and science, aside from those which have been noticed. The geography and history of foreign countries, their natural scenery and curiosities, their geology and botany, the manners and customs of the inhabitants, their superstitions and religious rites,—all these constitute subjects of inquiry, in which the learned world have a deep interest. And who, I ask, are more favorably situated to pursue such inquiries, and bring them to a successful issue, than foreign missionaries? A part of the work enjoined upon missionaries is that of *exploration*. They are to traverse their field of labor in all directions; observe its localities; study its history; note its peculiarities, physical and moral; and possess themselves (so far as they may) of every thing of general interest in regard to it. And whatever of importance they are able to learn, they are to communicate directly or indirectly to the world.

The period has not yet arrived, when the actual discoveries of missionaries, on the points above enumerated, can be appealed to in long detail. They have not had sufficient time and opportunity to accomplish more than a small part of what may yet be expected of them. Still, enough has been done, in correcting *mistakes* and *misapprehensions* which formerly prevailed, and in *positive contributions* to the cause of science, to entitle them to grateful consideration.

Let me notice a few instances, in which gross mistakes, of one kind or another, have been corrected.

In former times, when the uncivilized portions of the earth were less known than at present, it was common for navigators and travellers to return from their excursions, with the most extravagant accounts of their discoveries. Nothing was too absurd or ridiculous, to find a place in their veracious narratives. They seemed to vie, one with another, in their efforts at the marvellous; and he was sure to be the most successful author, who succeeded in telling the toughest story. For example, an ancient traveller,\* returning from the East, affirmed, that "the Bramins of India keep tubs full of rain, wind and thunder constantly by them, which they bestow upon their friends, or inflict upon their enemies, according to their pleasure;"—that "the earth swells and rolls, like the waves of the sea, only at the touch of a Bramin's wand;"—that at the feasts of the Bramins, "there is no need of servants, since the chairs, stools, pots, cups, dishes and plates understand every one its own office, and move spontaneously, hither and thither, as the case requires." He asserts that, in one country, he found women particolored, half black and half white; in another, a nation of pygmies, living under ground; in another, apes as large as men, and a kind of beasts having faces like men and bodies like lions. In another country which he visited, he found wool growing out of the ground like grass; and dragons as plenty as sheep in Arcadia.

At a much later period, the discoverers of the Nicobar Islands pretended that they had found a spring, which had the property of turning iron into gold; also, that the natives of those Islands were furnished with a suffix, such as Lord Monboddo supposed belonged originally to our whole race, but which the inhabitants of civilized countries, by too much sitting, had worn off. This latter story, no less a man than Linnaeus was inclined to believe.

At a still later period, the Spaniards who discovered Florida, alleged that they had found a spring which instantly restored the aged and infirm, who bathed in its waters, to all the verdure and vigor of youth.

---

\* Apollonius of Tyana, whom some modern infidels have held up as the rival and compeer of our Saviour. See his Life, written by Philostatus, an Athenian.

It was to ridicule and restrain this propensity for the marvellous, which induced Swift to entertain his readers with his celebrated Gulliverian tales,—an object in which he, to some extent, succeeded. His stories had about the same potency to check one evil, which the romance of Don Quixote had to remove another. Both, for the time, were pretty well laughed out of countenance. Still, neither the extravagance of travellers, nor the credulity of readers, was entirely cured at once. Enough of the evil still remained, to furnish abundant work of *correction* to the faithful missionary. It is not many years, for example, since it was seriously denied in England, that widows of the higher castes in India were accustomed to burn themselves on the funeral pile of their deceased husbands. But the researches of missionaries have settled this question, so that almost every child in Christendom is acquainted with the dreadful fact.

The accounts given by navigators who first visited the South Sea Islands, as to the character and condition of the natives, will be recollected by many who hear me. These natives were represented as the very children of nature,—unsuspecting, uncontaminated, free, amiable, devoid of care, and living together in an almost paradisaical state of innocence and happiness. Their females, like the sea nymphs of fable, came floating round the anchored vessel, as willing to attract the notice of the strangers, as to gratify their own reasonable curiosity. The glowing accounts which had been published as to the character and condition of these Islanders constituted an inducement, I believe, with the Directors of the London Missionary Society, to make them the *first* objects of their benevolent regards. The missionaries, accordingly, went and settled among them, and entered upon the work of their civilization and conversion. And they soon found what sort of characters they had to deal with, and how much the credulity of the public had been abused. They found as unequivocal marks of *Adamic descent* in these uncontaminated children of nature, as could be seen in any other portion of the world. They were treacherous, warlike, bloody, licentious, man-killers and man-eaters, murderers of fathers and mothers, and even of their own children. They were besotted in ignorance, averse to every kind of useful exertion, the slaves alike of their

chiefs, their idolatries, and their lusts. Such was the state in which these happy islanders were actually found; and in this state they *continued*, until the light of Christianity began to dawn upon their minds, and its sanctifying power was felt upon their hearts.

The misapprehensions which formerly prevailed, in regard to the *extent and value of Oriental learning generally*, were both gross and hurtful. Sir William Jones, and his coadjutors, contributed something towards correcting these evils; but much more has since been accomplished by the researches of missionaries. Of the justness of this remark I might give many proofs; but my limits confine me to two or three.

The most extravagant notions were entertained by *learned men*, and cherished until within the last half century, respecting the *divine wisdom* of the Hindoo Bramins, exhaustless stores of which were supposed to be treasured up in the Vedas, or their sacred books. It was presumed, by infidels of the last age, that when these came to be translated and opened, they would far surpass the Christian Scriptures, and bring them into utter contempt. The Vedas, indeed, have not been translated, for they have been found to be not worth translating; but, by the indefatigable Ward, and other missionaries, they have been opened and read, and the public have been fully apprized of their contents. And the age of wonder, conjecture and admiration, in regard to them, has passed quite away. They are found to be chiefly remarkable for their contradictions, exaggerations, indelicacies, puerilities, and for the nurture—the *fuel*—which they continually administer to some of the worst passions of the human heart.

A similar work to that here detailed has been performed in reference to the *Chinese Lawgiver*. He had long been exhibited as a prodigy of wisdom, almost justifying the superstition of his followers in ascribing to him divine honors. But, unfortunately for his reputation, the great Confucius has been translated. He has been raised, by the learned Marshman, from his long burial in the darkness of an unknown tongue, and brought out before the world. And now he appears as a very indifferent personage. He has become weak, like any other man.

We all know what has been the fate of the *fabulous legends* of China, when subjected to the scrutiny of some

of the Eastern missionaries. It used to be said, and by many believed, that the Chinese had unquestionable historical records, which carried back their origin to thousands and perhaps millions of years previous to the Mosaic account of the creation. The taunts and sneers, the boastings and exultations, of infidel writers and talkers, on this subject, were loud, and confident, and long. But, with all persons of common information, they have come to an end now. The whole matter has been investigated; and the result is, that, after every allowance which can reasonably be made, the Chinese have no claims to a higher antiquity than the days of Abraham.

I may refer to another instance of correction by a missionary, of a more recent date. A few years ago, an English philosopher went to New Holland, for the purpose of examining into the character of the natives, and ascertaining whether they were men or brutes. He collected and criticised a vast number of skulls, and at length came to the grave conclusion, and *published* it, that the natives were not human beings, but animals of the species of the orang-outang. Shortly afterwards, a Methodist missionary, laboring there, invited the philosopher to go with him and visit a converted native, on his death-bed. They went together; heard the native confess his sins, express his hope in Christ, quote Scripture, and speak, in general, of his religious experience. At the close of the interview, the missionary turned to the philosopher, and said, "Sir, did you ever see a monkey die after this manner?" The confounded philosopher could only reply, "*My philosophy stands corrected by your Christianity.*"

Of the work of *correction* performed by missionaries, we have had a notable example, of late, before our own eyes. A certain Oriental traveller and lecturer, who has been among us, has seemed disposed, in some instances, to treat his hearers much as our land-sellers and map-makers, down east, were wont, a few years ago, to treat their purchasers. They could make a fine forest here, and a lake, a river, a waterfall, there, just to suit their own convenience. And much in the same way our Oriental traveller has contrived to amuse and edify some of us. If he wanted a story to give interest to his narrative, he had no difficulty in finding one. If he needed some touching fact, or thrilling incident, "to point his moral, or adorn

his tale," it was always at hand. The errors inculcated, whatever may have been the intentions of the author (and I do not charge him with bad intentions), were really of a very injurious character. They respected the highly important subjects of *sacred geography* and *history*. And it is well for all concerned, that there was a missionary on his track,—one who had long resided in the countries described, and was perfectly acquainted with their localities and history,—who was able to set the matter right, and disabuse the public mind of the impositions which had been practised on it.

But I will not tire you by referring to more instances of *corrections* and *rectifications*. Those already noticed are sufficient to show that the learned world are under *some* obligations, on this account, to the studies and labors of faithful missionaries. Next to the importance of knowing any thing, is that of possessing *accurate* knowledge. And he who assists to correct our mistakes, and give us accuracy of knowledge, confers upon us an important benefit. It is obvious that missionaries in foreign lands have the best opportunities of contributing, in many ways, to the advancement of solid, substantial learning; and though, as I said, the period has not yet arrived when the results to be anticipated can be fully realized, yet *much has been already done*. I have time to touch on but a few topics more; and on these I can but barely touch.

By the labor of missionaries, new and previously unvisited regions of the earth's surface have, in many instances, been explored. The condition and circumstances, the customs and manner of life pursued by the natives, have been searched out. Their gods and demons, their idolatries, superstitions, and religious rites, have been investigated and exposed. At the different missionary houses in the city of Boston, there are whole rooms full of heathen gods, sufficient in number to form a museum,—figures the most grotesque, hideous, terrific, odious,—like nothing "in heaven above, or the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth,"—spoils won by the bloodless conflicts of missionaries, from heathen temples, and transmitted home as trophies of their victory.

In the journals of missionaries in new and unexplored regions, the features of different countries,—their towns and villages, their soils, rocks, mountains, rivers, animals,

vegetables, and natural curiosities,—are minutely described; and specimens, in great numbers, have been furnished, to grace the cabinets of the learned at home. One of the greatest *natural geological* wonders of the world has been discovered, within a few years, by missionaries at the Sandwich Islands. I refer to the dread volcano of Kirauea, with a crater of not less than eight miles in circumference, and 1500 feet in depth,—a volcano, compared with which Vesuvius and *Ætna*, with all their classic interest and fabled wonders of Cyclops, and thunderbolts, and giants, are little more than a blacksmith's forge.

Another important scientific work, which is in process of accomplishment through the labor of missionaries, is the settlement of numerous *geographical* difficulties, in reference to the situation of ancient cities and towns. It is known to every scholar, that the names of hundreds of places, mentioned in ancient sacred and profane history, are not found on our best maps; or, if found, their localities have been fixed by mere conjecture. But the missionaries, by residing and travelling in those ancient countries,—Greece, Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Egypt, &c.,—by observing and comparing different localities,—by becoming familiar with the languages and traditions of the natives,—are making new discoveries every year, and contributing to settle what before was merely conjectural, if not wholly unknown. And by settling questions of this sort, they are helping to settle others of equal importance in *ancient history*. Geography, it has been well said, is the eye of history. So far, then, as the eye is dimmed, put out, or wrongly directed, the page of history must be dark and uncertain. But when the eye is corrected and opened, we begin to see things clearly.

I ought to add, that something has been done, and more will be, towards ascertaining the *geology* and *mineralogy* of different countries. The geology of Palestine,—that holy land, the seat of so many sacred associations,—and more especially of the localities in the vicinity of the Dead Sea, is now in the progress of investigation, and the results will ere-long be published to the world.

In short, were the inquiry to be made, Who is it that, in modern times, has brought into notice, and laid fairly

open, in their geography, their natural history, their social and religious state, so many countries, before almost if not altogether unknown,—such as Greenland, Iceland, large portions of Africa, with the contiguous islands, Burmah, Siam, and Eastern Asia, the Indian Archipelago, Polynesia, and many parts of our own vast continent; the answer to this inquiry is obvious, and it is necessary. Commerce has not done it. It never would do it. Commerce is too selfish to engage extensively in enterprises of this nature. Literary curiosity and interest have not done it. At least, they have accomplished but little. If we except the efforts—very *laudable* ones, I confess—of the London Geographical Society, in their attempts to explore the interior of Africa, mere literary interest has effected almost nothing. The important work to which I refer has been performed obviously and almost exclusively by *Christian missionaries*. It is a result—though but an incidental one—of their sacrifices, their conflicts, and their toils. And the debt of gratitude which it imposes is justly due, in great measure, to them.

In the foregoing remarks, I have endeavored to show that,—from the *character* of missionaries, as learned, gifted men—from their *situation*, as permanent residents in foreign lands, having a familiar acquaintance with languages, localities, and other circumstances—and from the *nature of their pursuits*, being scholars, teachers, travellers, authors, as well as preachers of the gospel,—it might justly be anticipated that they would be able to do much for the cause of science and learning, as well as for the promotion of their more immediate objects. The learned world have much to expect of them. The connections between their great enterprise and the interests of learning are sufficiently numerous and obvious to justify such expectations. I have shown, too, as fully as possible within the limits assigned me, that the expectations which might reasonably be indulged have thus far been realized. In a great variety of ways, missionaries have labored in the cause of science, and have done all that for its advancement which could well be expected of them.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the missionary enterprise—at least the *Protestant* missionary enterprise—is but just commenced. The *great object* aimed at is but in the infancy of its accomplishment, and the *incident-*

*al* advantages to be anticipated are but just beginning to be realized. And if, under all the disadvantages of a new and untried undertaking, when the number of missionaries is comparatively few, and the most of them have been at their stations but a little while, so much as we have seen has been already done, what great results are to be expected, in the progress and consummation of this holy work! When the unevangelized portions of the earth shall have been explored and fully occupied by Christian missionaries—when, fired by a quenchless, apostolic zeal, they shall have penetrated and permeated the heart of Africa, the central and northern regions of Asia, the wilds of America, the deserts of New Holland, and all the islands of the sea—when they shall have scaled the walls of China and Japan, and planted the standard of the cross in every place on which the light of heaven shines—when missionaries shall have been longer at their posts, and shall have become more thoroughly acquainted with the languages, the literature, the localities and circumstances of the different nations—when their schools, their presses, their colleges, their seminaries, shall have been longer in operation, and, under the influence of these, native mind, all over the earth, shall have been roused into action, and learned natives, in great numbers, shall have been raised up—in a word, when the missionary enterprise, now in its infancy, shall have had a full development of its powers and resources, in a manly growth, and a just consummation—what great results may assuredly be expected, not only in a religious, but a *literary* point of view! I know not but I may be mistaken in the judgment I have formed in reference to this matter; but really it has seemed to me that the *literature* of the world has more to expect from the successful prosecution of the missionary enterprise, than from any other cause whatever. I certainly know of no other cause—I can think of no other—which is likely to produce so great results, even in a literary point of view.

And if this be true, then I may, in conclusion, address myself boldly and earnestly to *literary* men, and bespeak their favor for the cause of missions. Some of my readers, I know, deeply sympathize with this cause, from higher considerations than those here suggested. You love it, and value it, as *philanthropists* and as *Christians*. You

wish to see the multiform cruelties of the dark places of the earth abolished—their idolatries purged—their superstitions and their crimes for ever done away. You wish to see the debased *soul* of the poor heathen enlightened, elevated, purified, sanctified, and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

But if any shall read these pages whose views are unlike those of evangelical Christians generally, in regard to the *primary* objects of missions, such will bear me witness that these objects have not been urged unduly, on the present occasion. I have exhibited the missionary work in other connections, and have endeavored to enforce it on other grounds. I have addressed myself chiefly to *literary* men—the professed friends and promoters of science and learning. And, in view of what missionaries have already accomplished for the cause of learning, and the greater things which they may be expected to accomplish, I ask such men to dismiss their prejudices, if any have been indulged, and to regard, henceforth, with interest and favor, the mighty enterprise in which missionaries are engaged. I ask the *literati* of our country to follow, with their eye, those hundreds of learned, educated men, who are already abroad in different parts of the earth. Watch their movements; read their journals; note their discoveries in the different departments of useful learning. Listen to the accounts—not of unprincipled libertines, who sometimes wander among them, who cannot endure the strictness of their discipline, and to whose ungodly lives their holy example ministers a constant reproof—but to the accounts of *enlightened, virtuous, honorable* men, who have the opportunity of witnessing the results of their labors; and the more you become acquainted with missionaries in this way, the more, I am sure, you will honor them. The more you know of their work, in its progress and results, the more you will become interested in it, and the more earnestly you will desire to see it consummated.

## ARTICLE VII.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the division of the East and West. Translated by Members of the English Church.*

Vol. I. *The Confessions of S. Augustine. Revised from a former Translation. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D. D. With Illustrations from S. Augustine himself.* 8vo., pp. 363. Oxford. 1840.

Vol. II. *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem. Translated with Notes and Indices.* 8vo., pp. 308. Oxford. 1838.

Vol. III. Part I. *The Treatises of S. Cæcilius Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and Martyr. Translated with Notes and Indices.* 8vo., pp. 318. Oxford. 1839.

Vol. IV. Parts I and II. *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Translated with Notes and Indices.* 8vo., pp. 654. Oxford. 1839.

THERE are two points of view which may be taken of this enterprise of the Oxford divines, the one involving questions of an ecclesiastical nature, the other, considerations connected with general literature. Of the former, however great the interest of the subject, and however important a full and manly discussion of it would be, the limits of a literary notice forbid us to treat. Those who are acquainted with the present state of the English church, with the circumstances which caused the union of the old aristocracy and the high church party against the reformers in church and state, and with the character of the men at the head of this publication, will not be surprised at the phrase, "the Holy Catholic Church," in the title of the work, nor at the attempt made in the notes to revive a veneration for the crudities, as well as the sound doctrines and authorized usages, of the ancient church.

The Library of Fathers is edited by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, the Rev. John Keble, M. A., Professor of Poetry, and the Rev. J. H. Newman, B. D., Fellow of Oriel College, all of Oxford. Its chief design is to furnish the English reader with the leading treatises of the fathers on "Doctrine, Practice, Exposition of Holy Scripture, Refutation of Heresy, and History." Still, the originals of the works translated are also to be printed, so far as it shall appear desirable. Only entire treatises are to be translated; brief notices of authors are to be prefixed, and a few short notes, after the manner of the Benedictines, are to accompany the text. Four volumes octavo, of about four hundred pages each, are to be published annually, at the cost of nine shillings a volume to subscribers, and the addition of one-fourth to the public.\* Each volume, or at most two

\* The retail price in this country is about \$2,75 a volume.

volumes, are to form a whole in itself, but the volumes are to be continued uniform, so as to form complete sets.

Beside the works named at the head of this article, the following are in a course of preparation, viz., Cyprian's Letters, to form the second part of volume third; Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew and John, on the remaining epistles of Paul, his treatise on the Priesthood, and his epistles; the doctrinal treatises and epistles of Ambrose; Athanasius's four orations against the Arians; tracts on the incarnation, and on the Holy Spirit, and historical documents; Augustine's Anti-Pelagian tracts, homilies on the Gospel of John, and the Psalms, and some of the epistles; his practical treatises, epistles, and *City of God*; Basil's letters, treatises and homilies; Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius; the homilies of Ephraem Syrus; the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; sermons of Gregory of Nazianzum; sermons and commentaries of Gregory of Nyssa; Hilary on the trinity; Irenaeus against heresy; Jerome's epistles; Justin Martyr's works; sermons and epistles of Leo the Great; sermons of Macarius; Optatus on the Donatist schism; Origen against Celsus; Tertullian's works; Theodoret's ecclesiastical history, compendium of heresies, and dialogues, and a few miscellanies.

While this selection appears to be well adapted to answer the particular end of the publication, it is, also, in general, very well fitted to meet the wants of the scholar. Some of the works included in the selection we should have preferred to pass by, and others, now omitted, we should have inserted. But on this point we cannot reasonably enter any special complaint. With these general remarks, we pass to the separate volumes now before us.

(1.) *Augustine's Confessions*. This volume, though not first in its actual appearance, constitutes the first of the series. As we have, in a former number, expressed our views of the character of these Confessions, we have occasion now to consider the merits of the translation only, and the value and extent of Prof. Pusey's labors. The only English version of much value, which the translator could have before him, was that of the Rev. W. Watts, D. D., made in 1650. "This, however," it is said, in the preface, "which frequently retained the former translation [by Sir Tobias Matthews, a Catholic], retained also a good many faults; and, with some energy, it had many vulgarisms, so that, though it was adopted as the basis of the present, the work has in fact (?) been retranslated." We regret that we have not the old translation at hand, to verify this last assertion. If it be a *new* translation, it must have cost no little labor to give it such an antiquated dress, and to collect and embody so "many vulgarisms." We will group together a few of the elegances of Dr. Pusey's diction, if he is ambitious to claim them. The translation is full of such words and phrases as the following: "tongue-science," "haddest," "I was chief in the rhetoric school, whereat I joyed proudly," "any one an hungered," "as is their wont," "before foresignified," "no whit relaxing," "my fore-passed time," "by hap," "any whither," "still and still," "bespoken him most knowing," "mad vanity of pride," "affirm that too stiffly whereof he is ignorant," "make trial what he thought thereon," "mis-liked them evil," "to be freed wherefrom I was to go." The passage which we translated in the March number of the present year, eightieth page, is presented thus by Prof. Pusey: "For, passing through one of

the streets of Milan, I observed a poor beggar, then, I suppose, *with a full belly, joking and joyous*: and I sighed, and spoke to the friends around me of the many *sorrows of our phrenses*; *for that by all such efforts of ours, as those wherein I then toiled*, dragging along, under the goading of desire, the burthen of my own wretchedness, and by dragging, augmenting it, we yet *looked to arrive* only at that very joyousness, *whither that beggar-man had arrived before us*, who should never perchance attain it. For what he had obtained *by a few begged pence*, *the same was I plotting for by many a toilsome turning and winding*." Does the learned translator claim the merit of originality for these precious gems of courtly English? or would it be more charitable in us to suppose that, in his university easy-chair, it is more becoming his dignity to dress up an old book with a new type, and a pompous, high-church preface, than to sweat over the vulgar toils of a well-elaborated translation?

However deficient the translation is in the rhetorical coloring which characterizes the original, the sense is faithfully given. There is even a scrupulous exactness observable throughout the whole work. The notes consist chiefly of parallel passages,—"illustrations from Augustine himself,"—which are merely transferred from the Latin edition of Dubois. Most of the translator's peculiar labors appear to have been bestowed upon the exhibition of the more objectionable parts of Augustine's views of doctrine and discipline, for our imitation. In his preface alone the following reiterations of baptismal regeneration occur: "baptism, wherein all his transgressions were blotted out," "he was not a Christian, for he was not baptized," "which had been washed away by the waters of baptism," "they had been washed away by baptism."

(2.) *Cyril's Catechetical Lectures.* The interest felt by men of learning in these lectures is altogether peculiar. They are the only specimens of the kind which have descended to us from antiquity. As might be supposed, they have a great historical value, in consequence of the light which they cast upon the rites and usages connected with initiating catechumens into the sacred mysteries. The consecrated spot, too, where they were delivered, *Jerusalem*, near the sepulchre, and near the cross, and the character of the audience to which they were addressed, a whole congregation of enrolled catechumens, all of whom were to be baptized in one night, the eve of the annual festival in commemoration of the resurrection, both conspire to give a special interest to these compositions. They were probably delivered A. D. 328, a century after Cyprian's time. The first eighteen discourses relate to candidates preparing for baptism, and were, consequently, pronounced during the forty days' fast before Easter; the remaining five were addressed to the same persons immediately after their baptism. These last are very brief, though highly characteristic. The mode of baptism, repeatedly and very minutely described, is uniformly immersion; the subjects were such persons as offered themselves,—adults, of course, but not necessarily believers. No person who made application, and submitted to the course of instruction, was refused on the ground of not giving evidence of piety. Infant baptism is not *hereby* disproved, as has been sometimes supposed; it was a distinct thing, and it ultimately displaced the catechetical system. In these lectures, baptism is represented as a regeneration, and its necessity to salvation is insisted on.

The bread and wine, also, in the eucharist, are regarded as no longer bread and wine after consecration, but as the body and blood of Christ. These two ordinances, and the various rites and doctrines connected with them, are treated as great mysteries; and the catechumens, who have been initiated, are charged not to betray the holy secret. In the nineteenth lecture,—the first after baptism,—Cyril begins: “I long ago desired, true-born and dearly beloved children of the church, to discourse to you concerning these spiritual and heavenly mysteries. Let us now teach you exactly, that you may know the meaning of what was done on that evening of your baptism. First, ye entered the outer hall of the baptistery, and there, facing towards the west, ye heard the command to stretch forth your hand, and, as in the presence of Satan, ye renounced him.” They faced to the west, as the region of darkness, —a symbol of the kingdom of darkness, now to be renounced. The “pomp of Satan,” which was also renounced, was “the madness of shows, and horse-races, and hunting, and all such vanity;” his “service” included all the rites and superstitions connected with idolatry. Afterwards, the candidates turned to the east, the symbol of light, and professed their belief in the trinity, and in baptism. The twentieth lecture is on the rite of baptism. As soon as the candidates entered into the inner chamber, they put off their garment, “and this was an image of putting off the old man, with his deeds,” “in this also imitating Christ, who hung naked on the cross.” Then they were “anointed with exorcised oil, from the very hairs of their head to their feet, and were made partakers of the good olive-tree.” Then, says Cyril, “ye were led to the holy pool of divine baptism, as Christ was carried from the cross to the sepulchre, *which is before your eyes.*” “O, strange and inconceivable thing! we did not really die, we were not really buried; but our imitation was but in a figure, while our salvation is in reality.” Lecture twenty-first is on the *chrism*. “Being therefore made partakers of Christ, ye are properly called Christs; and of you God said, *Touch not my Christs*, or anointed. Now ye were made Christs, by receiving the emblem of the Holy Ghost; and all things were in a figure wrought in you, because ye are figures of Christ.” How obvious it is, from these representations, that the age of Cyril, was an *emblematic* age. Ideas and hints, contained, or supposed to be contained, in the Scriptures, were set forth in *outward forms*. The ritual was a commentary; these same feelings were afterwards expressed in Christian art. We cannot agree with Mr. Newman, that these writings “enable us to determine what the doctrines of the *apostles* were;” but they do enable us to determine many things which would have been as strange to the apostles as they are to us.

The quotations which have here been made, will give a favorable impression of the translation, executed by Mr. Church, Fellow of Oriel College. The preface, by Mr. Newman, like that of Prof. Pusey to Augustine’s Confessions, is an elaborate essay in defence of the authority of the fathers as “witnesses to the religion which the *apostles* transmitted to the early church.” The notes to this volume are very few; but there is an interesting account of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and a ground plan of it, or rather of the two,—the Anastasis, on the site of the sepulchre, and the Basilica of Constantine, separated from it only by a court. In the former, the first eighteen lectures were

delivered, and the remaining five to the baptized, in the latter. With these few words, we take leave of this volume, in order to devote more particular attention to those which follow.

(3.) *Cyprian's Treatises.* Cyprian was bishop of Carthage from A. D. 248 to A. D. 258. He and Augustine did more than any other Christian father in giving form and character to the doctrines and practice of the Latin church. Augustine was a profound thinker; Cyprian was an energetic actor in practical life. Augustine was a theologian; Cyprian was an ecclesiastic. Augustine was lord over the creed of the church; Cyprian was lord over its external organization. Augustine was the favorite of the scholastic divines; Cyprian was, and is, the favorite of bishops.

We read the writings of Cyprian with mingled feelings of pleasure and of pain, of admiration and of contempt. We follow him in his straight-forward, manly course, in his honest feelings and actions, in his energy and firmness, in his fidelity and goodness, and involuntarily pronounce him to be an honor to Christianity and an ornament of the church. And then, again, we see his over-bearing spirit, his struggle for power,—to magnify his office, it is true, rather than his person,—his management with the church at Rome, by a kind of diplomatic maneuvering, reluctantly yielding, in part, to the claims of the Roman bishop in regard to power and influence, and obtaining, in return, the use of the authority, thus grudgingly and partially conceded, in support of his own cause in the first great conflict between the bishop, on the one hand, and the presbyter and deacon on the other, and finally obtaining a victory by power and influence, rather than by reason and argument; and, connected with all this, we see his gross and sensual views of religion and of Christian ordinances, his unphilosophical and unsound principles, his puerile reasonings, and his weak superstition, and feel dissatisfied with him, and indignant that sensible and learned men, that modern ecclesiastical dignitaries, and guides of the church, should expend their labor and strength to show that this same Carthaginian bishop is the pillar and ground of the truth.

We would refer the reader to the whole body of Cyprian's Letters, which are more valuable than his Treatises, and which are soon to follow them in the series of translations, as furnishing the most satisfactory evidence of the good qualities which we have ascribed to him. For a faithful picture of his episcopal character and conduct, we would specially recommend to the reader to consult Neander's account of him in the first volume of his Church History.

We will here present some of Cyprian's crude notions, partly because they illustrate the spirit of his age, and partly because they will enable the reader to judge how far his wisdom was divine. We select the subject of baptism, as the best nucleus for the views which we are to exhibit. Of that ordinance he says, in his seventy-third epistle: "from this is the origin of all faith, and the saving entrance to the hope of eternal life, and the divine mercy in purifying and renovating the servants of God." Intimately connected with this is another doctrine of Cyprian's, that there is no salvation out of the church. Of course, then, that ordinance which was introductory to the church would be a saving ordinance. The grossest ideas of the efficacy of baptism are expressed in his seventieth epistle. "The water," it is there said,

"must be first purified and sanctified by the priest, so that it can wash away in baptism the sins of him that is baptized." Again, in the same epistle: "It is necessary also that the baptized be anointed, in order that, after having received the chrism, that is, the unction, he may be able to be the anointed of God, and have within him the grace of Christ." Prof. Newman, in his preface to the work before us says: "S. Cyprian himself [therefore, it must be true!] attributes his change of heart and life to his baptism," referring to the passage: "But after that life-giving water succored me, washing away the stain of former years, what was hidden was revealed, and what was dark began to shine." But we might quote a still more edifying passage, in his seventy-sixth epistle, where it is said: "The devil's obstinate malice extends only to the saving water; in baptism he loses all the venom of his malice." A proof of this is found in the fact that Pharaoh's wickedness could extend only to the Red Sea, where the Israelites were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. "So at the present day, the devil is, by the exorcists, with human voice and divine power, scourged, and scorched, and tormented. But when one comes to the saving water, and to the sanctification of baptism, he must know and believe that there the devil is subdued, and that the man, consecrated to God, is, by divine mercy, liberated. For as scorpions and serpents, which are strong while on dry ground, but, when cast into the water, lose their strength and venom, so foul spirits, which are called scorpions and serpents, and yet are trampled upon by us, through the power given of God, cannot remain any longer in the body of a man in whom, after baptism and sanctification, the Spirit begins to dwell." How apostolic,—how worthy of being imbibed by every Protestant divine!

The treatises of Cyprian are thirteen in number; viz., on the grace of God, the vanity of idols, Scripture testimonies against the Jews, the dress of virgins, the unity of the church, the lapsed, the Lord's prayer, an address to Demetrianus, the mortality, works and alms, the benefit of patience, jealousy and envy, and an exhortation to martyrdom.

The first was composed soon after his baptism. It is a florid and bombastic representation of the reasons which influenced him in his religious change. Fortunately, it is the only specimen which he has given of such false rhetoric. The translation of the present volume, for which the editor acknowledges himself indebted to the Rev. Charles Thornton, is in smooth and elegant English. Nothing can be more perfect than the manner in which the style of this first treatise is imitated. The author thus introduces his subject:

"You rightly remind me, most dear Donatus; I remember my promise, and this is of a truth fit season for performing it, when the vintage gives holiday, and the mind, abandoning itself to repose, enjoys the recurring and appointed resting-time of the wearied year. The place, too, suits the day; and the fair face of the gardens joins with the mild airs of gentle autumn, in soothing and cheering the senses. It is pleasant here to lead on the day in talk, and to form the heart toward a knowledge of the revealed will, by edifying narratives. And that no profane intruder may induce restraint on our converse, or the ill-ruled tongues of a loud family out-talk it, pass we unto this seat." Few boarding-school misses could out-do the honeyed sweetness and soft sentimentality of this introduction. The following apology is

exquisite: "Yet what in sum or substance can be any thoughts imparted by me to you? The poor worth of my narrow wit puts out but a sorry harvest,—no weighty, generous stalks give wealth to the herbage; still, with what power I can, I will make the endeavor. I have, indeed, a support in my subject. Accept, then, what, without talent, is still substantial; no tinselled art of words, to catch the common ear, but simple things, in their rude truth, which go to preach God's mercy." But the general character of the piece is more manly, and contains many good observations upon the effect of Christianity on the heart, as contrasted with the influence of worldly motives and principles.

The second treatise, on the vanity of idols, is an attack upon paganism, as the third is upon the Jews. These three pieces contain the apologetic part of Cyprian's writings. The work on the vanity of idols contains but little that is original; the first two parts, the attack upon polytheism, and the evidence of the unity of God, being taken mostly from Minucius Felix, and the third, concerning the person of Christ, being copied almost verbatim from Tertullian. This last fact will appear the less strange, when we remember the story told by Jerome, that Cyprian never passed a day without reading Tertullian, and was continually saying to his amanuensis, "Da Magistrum,"—*hand me my master*. As the Scripture testimonies against the Jews contain but little else than a copious selection of texts in support of innumerable positions laid down by the author, we can learn from it scarcely any thing, except that Cyprian was a poor interpreter.

The very title of the next piece, on the dress of virgins, shows that as early as the middle of the third century the papal view of the sanctity of virgins began to be entertained; and the exhortations and admonitions of the bishop prove that the abuses growing out of that system were not unknown even then. The main object of the writer seems to have been to counteract the love of worldly display, perhaps among others as well as among those who had taken the vow.

We propose to dwell a little upon this topic, and put the reader in possession of some of the leading thoughts contained in the treatise, because it will furnish a good opportunity to obtain a just view, both of what is praiseworthy and what is censurable in the character of Cyprian's practical piety. He commences by saying: "Discipline—the safeguard of hope, the stay of faith, our guide in the way of salvation, the stimulant and nourisher of inward goodness, the teacher of virtue—causes us to abide in Christ always, and live unto God continually, and to come to the promises of heaven, and the divine rewards. It tends to salvation to follow her, to death to turn away and neglect her.—It is the word of the Lord, when giving health and instruction together, *Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee*. He gives him his rule of life; having granted him health, he gives the law of innocency; suffering him no more to wander with lax and easy rein, but threatening more grievous things to him who becomes the slave again of those evils of which he had been healed.—Let men and women alike, let young and old, of either sex and every age, give heed according to the conscientiousness and fidelity which they owe to God, lest what is received of the Lord's mercy in holiness and purity be guarded with too little anxiety." Such is the general spirit of Cyprian's instructions and counsel in matters of

practical religion. In all his practical writings, he grasps his point with a vigorous mind, presents its importance in an impressive manner, clothes his thought with the authority of the word of God, and then honestly and fervently presses the claims of duty upon the conscience.

"It is my present object," he goes on to say, "to address those females who have professed the single life, for whom our solicitude is proportioned to the high station they occupy. They are the flower of the church's growth, the charm and ornament of spiritual grace, a happy nature, a perfect and inviolate work of praise and honor, an image of God fashioned after the Lord's sanctity, the more honorable portion of the flock of Christ.—To these I speak, these I exhort, in affection rather than by authority; not claiming a liberty of censure, last and least as I am, and very conscious of unworthiness, but because the growing interest I feel is attended with an increased fear of the assaults of Satan." This is sufficiently flattering to the *fairer* portion of the flock, and we must regard the language as honestly employed, notwithstanding the necessity that was undoubtedly felt of conciliating those virgin minds as much as possible, in order to prepare them to receive keen reproof.

After quoting Matt. 19: 11, and other passages of Scripture in support of such a mode of life, he continues: "If, then, continency is a following of Christ, and the virgin life has its destiny in the kingdom of God, what have they to do with the world's apparel and adornings, wherewith, while seeking to please men they offend God?—It may not be, that the virgin should plait her hair for display of beauty, or glory in the flesh and its charms, when her chief contest is against the flesh and her unweared striving is to conquer and subdue her body.—Or if she must glory in the flesh, then let her do so when she is tormented for confessing the Christian name,—when she, a woman, proves more strong than men, her torturers, when she endures burnings, or crucifixion, or sword, or wild beasts, for the sake of her crown. This is jewelry for the flesh worth the wearing, these are the body's best embellishments." And of such heroic females there were not a few in his own Carthage. It can hardly be surprising that one who was familiar with such characters should speak of the consecrated sisterhood in terms of high admiration.

Advancing still nearer to his object, he says: "Some females there are, however, who enjoy ample possessions, and who make their opulence an excuse.—Let them learn, first, that she is really rich, who is rich towards God, that she is wealthy, who is wealthy in Christ, and that those are blessings, which are spiritual, divine and heavenly.—*Let women adorn themselves with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array.* You say that you are rich. Yet not every thing we can, ought we also to do.—Moreover, if you broider your hair, and parade yourself in public, attract the eyes of youth and raise their sighs, you cannot be acquitted on the ground of your chastity of heart.—You say you are rich; but the virgin may not vaunt her riches.—Use your wealth, but for the things of salvation; use it, but for good designs; use it, but for the end which God has commanded. Teach the poor that you are rich; teach the needy that you are wealthy; lend God your fortune and give bread to Christ. There trust your treasures where no thief breaks through, and no crafty assailant can force his way. It is itself a sin against God, to think that

riches are given you to riot in to the peril of your soul. God has given a voice to man, but not for the purpose of singing indecent songs; God provides iron for the cultivation of the land, but not therewith to commit murder.—A gaudiness of ornament and apparel, and the attractions of figure, are fit for none but fallen and shameless women; they are richest in dress who are poorest in modesty.—It was not God's work that sheep should be scarlet or purple; nor was it his teaching to dye and color wool with the juice of herbs and with shell-fish; nor framed he necklaces of stones and pearls inlaid with gold. Is it God's will that the ears should be pierced, with which pain is given to innocent infancy, ignorant of the world's evil?—All females whatever ought to be cautioned that what God has formed, what he made and fashioned, ought in no wise to be tampered with, whether with yellow dye, or black powder, or rouge, or any other preparation at all, which undoes the lineaments of nature.—Tell me, have you no fear that at the day of resurrection your Maker will not recognize you, but will set you aside and say, 'This is not my work; this is not our image?' Your complexion you have polluted with false coloring, your hair you have altered by unnatural dyes, your countenance is captured by a lie, your natural appearance lost, your look is not your own. You will no longer be able to see God, whose eyes are no longer his workmanship, but the devil's craft. Those glaring painted eyes are copied from the serpent; you dress after your foe now, you will burn after his fashion hereafter." Let those of our readers take warning to whom such warning belongs.

We cannot with propriety transfer to our pages what the honest and indignant bishop says about "frequenting the public baths." If there was so often occasion for the "church to bewail her virgins, and groan over scandalous tales concerning them," as is here intimated, the treatise itself was loudly called for, and the subject was treated not without skill. We leave to the intelligent reader the task of sifting out and separating the good from the bad in Cyprian's views as here exhibited, and proceed in course to the other parts of the volume.

There was now an interval of several years before the next treatise on the Unity of the Church was written, during which the Decian persecution so raged that Cyprian was obliged to flee from Carthage. It was at this time that the schism as it is called, of Novatus and Felicissimus, a presbyter and a deacon of the church in that place, broke out with great violence. In their *principles* they were substantially right; in their *conduct* they were manifestly wrong. They maintained the good old doctrine of the equality of bishop and presbyter, and the independence of deacons. What was objectionable in their procedure was, that some of the party, who had been rival candidates with Cyprian for the episcopal office, manifested unbecoming feelings of jealousy; that the party in general, unjustly accused the bishop of unfaithfulness and cowardice in leaving his flock in order to flee from persecution; that they restored to fellowship the lapsed against Cyprian's views of strict discipline, and thus strengthened their party by doubtful means; that they encouraged the arrogance of the confessors [those who confessed Christ in persecution, but nevertheless escaped martyrdom], who interfered with discipline by giving written certificates or orders for the restoration of those who had fallen; and lastly, that the opposition was conducted in a violent and passionate manner.

It was Cyprian's policy, to attack this party as *schismatics*, and to take his ground on the doctrine of the *unity of the church*, and the inviolability of those who were its regular and divinely appointed officers. The manner in which he argued his point, has given great historical importance to this part of his writings; and Papists and Protestants have always disputed about the interpretation of Cyprian's words. It must be conceded, that Cyprian intended to say more than a good Protestant can admit as true, while it is quite certain that the Papists, by attaching a modern technical sense to words which could not well have such a meaning in the third century, have claimed more support from Cyprian than his language warrants. Most of what is maintained by this writer would be true if understood of the *spiritual church*; and his fundamental error consists in applying, as his purpose required, to the external, visible church what is true only of the former.

After setting forth the necessity of being wise and prudent, as well as harmless, he says, by way of introduction; "That persecution is not the only one to be feared, which advances by open assault to the ruin and downfall of God's servants; caution is easy, where the danger is manifest; and the mind is in readiness for the battle, when the enemy makes himself known. More to be feared and more to be watched is a foe, who creeps upon us unawares, who deceives us under the image of peace, and glides forward with those hidden movements, which have given him the name of serpent.—What now can be more crafty, or what more artful, than for this enemy, detected and downfallen by the advent of Christ, now that light is come to the nations, seeing his idols left, his seats and temples deserted, to invent the new deceit, by which to draw the incautious into error, while retaining the Christian name? He has made heresies and schisms, wherewith to subvert faith, to corrupt truth, and rend unity. Those whom he cannot detain in the blindness of the old way, he compasses and deceives by misleading them on their new way." A very sensible and skilful introduction, though not very complimentary to the seven presbyters, the deacon, and their followers.

Next follow his main positions. "This will be, most dear brethren, so long as there is no regard to the source of truth, no looking to the Head, nor keeping to the doctrine of our heavenly Master. If any one consider and weigh this, he will not need length of comment or argument. It is easy to offer proofs to a faithful mind, because in that case the truth may be quickly stated. The Lord said unto Peter, 'I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church,' &c. Upon him, being one, he builds his church; and though he gives to all the apostles an equal power, yet, in order to manifest unity, he has by his own authority so placed the source of the same unity, as to begin from one. Certainly the other apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honor and power; but a commencement is made from unity, that the church may be set before us as one."

As most of our controversial writers give a very unsatisfactory account of the origin of the Roman bishop's power, we will translate Neander's remarks, in which he alludes to this passage of Cyprian. "Even were we to consider the apostle Peter as the representative of the unity of the church, it would not thence follow, that such a representation was to be continued through all the ages of the church. Still

less would it follow, that the representation was to be made in the church at Rome. For, although there is no sufficient reason for doubting the tradition that the apostle Peter visited the Roman church, it is certain that he neither founded it, nor presided over it. Still as from the idea of an *external* union of the church, that of an external representation of this union might easily spring, so the idea of that representation in the person of Peter might be held in such a light as to imply that this outward representation of the unity of the church in a particular place belonged to the essence of its external unity in all places and throughout all time. And as most of the western churches looked upon the church at Rome as a mother-church,—an apostolical church,—and were accustomed to appeal to its authority; and as they were accustomed to regard Peter as its founder, and to quote its tradition as descending from him; and as Rome was the seat of the political union of the empire; it naturally happened that men habituated themselves to regard the Roman church as the *cathedra Petri*, and to transfer to it what was said of the apostle Peter as the representative of the unity of the church. We find this train of thought actually in Cyprian. This idea was indeed very vague, and hence, after a false principle was established, it was the easier to attach to it and draw out of it more than it contained.”\*

Still, Cyprian was but an indifferent Papist. In his fifty-fifth letter, written to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, he complains of him, whether consistently with himself or not, for interfering in a matter that pertained to the discipline of the church at Carthage, and says to him in language altogether unequivocal; “To each pastor is assigned a portion of the flock, which he is to rule and govern, and give account thereof to his Lord.” And in the *Allocutio in Conc. Carthag.*, speaking upon the same point, he said; “Each bishop, by virtue of his liberty and power, has an independent jurisdiction of his own, so that he is amenable to no other, and no other one is amenable to him. But we all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only has the power of committing to us the government of his church, and of judging of our acts.”

We proceed with our extracts from the work which we are examining. Says the author, “Does he who holds not this unity of the church, think that he holds the faith? Is he, who strives against and resists the church, assured that he is in it?—The episcopate is one; it is a whole, in which each enjoys full possession. The church likewise is one, though she is spread abroad, and multiplies with the increase of her progeny; even as the sun has many rays, yet one light; and the tree many boughs, yet its strength is one;—and as when many streams flow from one source, unity is preserved in the source itself. Make the attempt to separate the ray from the sun, the unity of the light cannot be divided; break a branch from the tree, it can bear no more fruit; separate the stream from its fountain, and it becomes dry. It is of the church that we are born; we are nourished from her breast, and are quickened by her breath. He cannot have God for a father, who has not the church for a mother.” Here we have the grand papal sophism. The fallacy lies in predicating of the visible church,—whose lines are never drawn with strict accuracy, and are always liable to include

---

\* Church History, Vol. I, p. 229.

unbelievers and exclude believers,—what is true only of the spiritual church. What Cyprian says, would be just, if spoken of the kind of union which every true Christian has with all other true Christians. He must indeed be united to them in Christian love, in order to prove the genuineness of his Christian character. This is essentially the union which is spoken of in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and which can be applied to external union only so far as that corresponds with the former. But Cyprian confounds these distinct things. The spiritual members out of the visible church are infinitely more closely connected with those who are spiritual in the church, than the latter are with irreligious members. What an egregious mistake, to substitute this accidental, external, and often only apparent, union for that internal bond which consists of holy love! But it is said, this spiritual union exists in the visible church. Very well; the only question, then, on the supposition of such a coincidence, is, whether the external union is the cause, and the spiritual union the effect, or vice versa.

But in order to fortify his position the more strongly, and secure himself against certain points of attack, he says, in a tone of reproof and even sarcasm: “Neither let certain persons beguile themselves by a vain interpretation, in that the Lord hath said, ‘Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, I am with them.’ Those who corrupt and falsely interpret the gospel, lay down what follows, but omit what goes before; giving heed to part, while they deceitfully suppress a part; as themselves are sundered from the church, so they divide what is united in one passage. For when the Lord was impressing agreement and peace upon his disciples, he said, ‘If two of you shall agree on earth.’ he places agreement first; hearts at peace are the first condition;—yet how can he be said to be at agreement with others, who is at disagreement with the body of the church itself and with the universal brotherhood? How can two or three be gathered together in Christ’s name, who are manifestly separate from Christ and from his gospel?”

No doubt men, whether schismatics or not, if separated from the body of Christ, cannot be gathered together in Christ’s name. But here again, as Neander well remarks, the effect is put for the cause. Not the external separation, but the inward character excludes them from the promise; and with this character, even if they were in the church, they would still be unable to claim the promise. On the other hand, if they were true believers, they would be truly members of Christ’s spiritual body, whether members of his visible church or not. ‘But true believers will be members of the visible church.’ And so it may be said, true believers will do *every thing* which they ought to do, that is, will be perfect. In general (for there are exceptions, sometimes from physical, sometimes from moral necessity), Christians *ought* to be externally connected with the church. But it is quite too papal to infer reality from obligation, a *fact* from mere *duty*.

About the same time Cyprian wrote his little work concerning the Lapsed, or those who had fallen from their faith in the time of persecution. As the former treatise aimed directly at checking the schism, this was designed to effect reconciliation between the author and the confessors who were likely to break with him, and whose influence, supported as it was by the church at Rome, might easily give victory

to the schismatics. Here again, as when treating of the deference due to the Roman bishop, where many think they find an irreconcilable contradiction in his different statements, he had a difficult task to perform, that of gaining his point with the confessors, without taking ground inconsistent with that formerly maintained by him. He had been strongly opposed to showing the least leniency towards the lapsed, and his letters on the subject were before the public. The confessors and the Roman church were at variance with him on this point, and yet their countenance and support were now indispensable to him. The same man who felt it his duty to make great concessions to the bishop of Rome in regard to ecclesiastical authority, when that authority was needed in his own support, could now fetch a sweep of a semicircle in his views of discipline, for the sake of winning over the influential confessors. We complain not of the change in itself considered, for the subject of discipline is much better treated in this new work, than in his former letters. Possibly experience had made him wiser, and his change of views was owing as much to an internal as to an external cause. If so, it was for him a lucky coincidence. Still, nothing can be more plain, than that the confessors had gone to the opposite extreme, and that Cyprian had always been nearer right than they. The treatise is one of great interest, as it lets the reader, as it were, into the interior of the ancient church, and shows him its character and its trials in the very midst of persecution. Indeed, the views of the author are so sound and practical, his suggestions and gentle admonitions so salutary, and his concern for the true interests of the church so obviously sincere, that we forget the weakness of which we have been speaking, and think only of him as a noble martyr.

The seventh treatise, that on the Lord's Prayer, has been greatly admired in all ages of the church. Rettberg, in his Life of Cyprian, which we have particularly consulted, says; "In no work of Cyprian does the whole Christian character of the man speak out so distinctly as in this." All that we can here do, is warmly to recommend it to the pious reader.

The two next works in order contain nothing that is very remarkable; the address to Demetrianus was designed to meet the objection, that the pestilence which raged at that time was owing to the anger of the gods at the spread of Christianity; the treatise on the Mortality was written to console Christians at a time not unlike that when the cholera raged among us.

The doctrine of *good works*, in the Catholic sense of the term, is fully and elaborately taught in what the author wrote on Works and Alms.

The next is an admirable discourse on Patience. The subject is treated with ability, the topics well chosen, and the whole written with spirit.

The succeeding essay on Jealousy and Envy sets forth the evils of a contrary course, and betrays great feeling. Some suppose it was written for the special benefit of the bishop of Rome.

The Exhortation to Martyrdom, the last of Cyprian's treatises, is a collection of Scripture texts like that of the Testimonies against the Jews.

(4.) *Chrysostom's Homilies on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* It is pleasing to observe the numerous indications of a reviving interest in the writings of this Christian orator, the brightest ornament of the ancient Greek church. His single treatise on the Priesthood, was stereotyped by Tauchnitz, in 1826, was translated into German by Hasselbach, in 1821, translated again, with notes, by J. T. Ritter, in 1822, and still again by Weber, in 1833. In 1834, the best text, with an admirable commentary, was published by A. E. Leo; in 1837, it was edited again by Lomler, and formed the first number in his series of the *opera praestanissima* of Chrysostom. In Leyden, Voorst edited selections from Chrysostom, with a Latin translation and notes (1827-1830); in England, Frederic Field, of Cambridge, has recently issued a new edition of Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew, in three volumes, the first two containing the text, and the last a valuable body of explanatory notes; in Germany, besides Lomler's Selections, there are recent translations by Mayer, Arnoldi and Wagner; in France, the splendid republication of Chrysostom's entire works, revised, corrected and enlarged by the learned Ludwig von Sinner, has just been completed; and now we have before us a new English translation of the homilies on the first of Corinthians.

The homilies of Chrysostom are valuable to us as specimens both of interpretation and of preaching. These homilies are, properly speaking, expository lectures, the first part of each being explanatory of the text of a connected portion of Scripture, the second part being a discussion of some leading topic. We will introduce the reader at once to this Christian Father's manner. His third homily is on 1 Cor. 1: 10-17. He comments upon the words, upon the apostle's design, and more particularly the skill with which he adapts his reproofs and instructions to character and circumstances, and his adroitness in touching the right chords to move the heart. He then takes his key-note from the expression, "*not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.*" He alludes to the current reproach of ignorance cast upon the apostles and primitive Christians. "When the Greeks charge the disciples with being uneducated, let us urge this accusation even more than they," is his language. After a few remarks, he adds;

"I have said these things, because I once heard a Christian disputing in a ridiculous manner with a Greek, and both parties, in their dispute, refuting themselves. For what the Christian ought to have said, this the Greek asserted; and what one would naturally suppose the Greek would say, this the Christian maintained. The point of controversy respected the superiority of Paul or Plato, the Greek endeavoring to show that Paul was unlearned and ignorant; and the Christian in his simplicity being anxious to prove that Paul was more eloquent than Plato. The victory was on the side of the Greek, as his argument proved to be the stronger. Now if Paul were a more eloquent teacher than Plato, many would probably object that it was not by grace, but by excellency of speech, that he prevailed. Thus the Christian's assertion was in favor of the cause of the Greek, and what the Greek said was in the Christian's favor. For if Paul was uneducated and yet overcame Plato, the victory was brilliant. The former, unlearned as he was, persuaded the disciples of the latter, and brought them over to his views; whence it is evident that the gospel was the result not of

human wisdom, but of the grace of God. That we may not fall into the same error, and be laughed to scorn for arguing thus with the Greeks, let us charge the apostles with want of learning, for this very charge is praise. When they say that the apostles were rude, let us add that they were untaught and unlettered, and poor, and insignificant, and simple, and obscure persons. It is not a slander on the apostles, but it is their glory, that notwithstanding they were such, they yet outshone the whole world. For these uneducated, rude, unlettered disciples completely vanquished philosophers, nobles and sovereigns, and those who flourished in wealth, and honor, and external advantages. Whence it is manifest, that the power of the cross is mighty, and that these things were not achieved by human strength. For the results were not according to the course of nature, but the reform produced far surpassed nature. When any thing is done which not only surpasses, but far surpasses nature in virtue and utility, it is very clear that it is effected by a divine power and interposition. For consider; the fisherman, the tent-maker, the publican, the rude and unlettered man, coming from the remote land of Palestine, drove from their own seat the philosophers, rhetoricians and orators, and prevailed against them in a short time, notwithstanding they had to contend with many dangers, the opposition of people and kings, the resistance of [human] nature itself, the inveteracy of established, time-hallowed usages, demons in arms, the devil in battle-array and stirring up all, kings, people, nations, cities, barbarians, Greeks, philosophers, orators, sophists, writers, laws, tribunals, various penalties and deaths innumerable, and of all sorts. Nevertheless, all these were confuted and gave way when the fishermen spoke.—Thus let us overcome, thus contend against them and vanquish them by our lives rather than by our words. For this is the chief struggle, the unanswerable argument which speaks through our actions. Let us win them, therefore, by our life. Many, even among the untaught, have astonished the mind of philosophers, by exhibiting the philosophy which shows itself in actions, and by speaking in more than trumpet tones through their mode of life and piety. For this is more persuasive than all human tongues.—Let us win them by our mode of life, and with these souls build up the church, and in these lay up our treasure. Nothing can compare with a soul, no, not the whole world. Though thou shouldst give boundless treasures to the poor, thou wilt not do so much as he who converts one soul. It is indeed a great virtue to have compassion on the poor; but not so great as to rescue them from error. For he that does this, follows in the footsteps of Paul and Peter. We are permitted to receive their gospel without their dangers and without their sufferings from famine, pestilence, and other evils (for the present is a time of peace); but not without their ready and active zeal. Even while sitting at home we may practise this species of fishery. Whoever has a friend, or a relative, or an inmate of his house, let him thus act and thus speak, and he shall be like a Peter and a Paul. But why do I say Peter and Paul? He shall be the mouth of Christ.—Though thou persuade not to-day, thou mayst to-morrow; and even shouldst thou never persuade, still thou shalt have thy full reward. Though thou persuade not all, thou mayst a few. The apostles did not persuade all men, yet they discoursed with all, and for all they have their reward. For God is accustomed to bestow crowns, not according to the

result of good deeds, but according to the intention of the doer."\*—pp. 30—34.

In these few passages, partly disrupted from their natural connection, and obscured and enfeebled by translation, we see some of the movements of that great mind and greater heart which could thrill the bosoms of thousands and draw involuntary applause even from Pagan hearers. Chrysostom was eminently practical as a preacher; but at the same time his mind was singularly inventive, his views both penetrating and expansive, and his power of illustration and description surpassingly great. A few sentences will exhibit the qualities of his mind in these respects.

"He has well called it *being puffed up*. For when one particular member rises and swells above the rest, it is nothing but an inflammation and disease.—And so in the body of the church also; whoever is inflamed and puffed up, must be the diseased portion."

"But if you are in a hurry, and wait not for the time of retribution, think of those who lend money to men; for not even these desire to get their interest immediately; but they are anxious that the principal should remain a long time in the hands of the borrower, provided only the repayment be secure and they have no want of confidence in the borrower. Let this be done in the present case, also [respecting the words, *He that giveth unto the poor lendeth unto God*]. Leave your gifts with God, that he may make a manifold return. Seek not to have the whole here; for if you recover it all here, how will you receive it hereafter!"

"For the people is our master; and the great mob is a savage master, a severe tyrant, not so much as a command being needed in order to make us listen to him; it is enough that we just know what he wills, and, without a command, we submit, so great good-will do we bear towards him. But God, threatening and admonishing day by day, is not heard; and yet the common people, full of disorder, made up of all manner of dregs, has no occasion for one word of command; it is enough for it to signify its pleasure, and in all things we obey immediately."

"As physicians soothe their patients—so let us also act towards the lovers of money. When they say, We desire to be rich, let us not say immediately that wealth is an evil thing; but let us assent, and say that we also desire it; but in due time; yea, true wealth: yea, that which affords undying pleasure; yea, that which is continually accruing, and not for others, and those often our enemies. And let us exhibit the lessons of true wisdom, not prohibiting riches, but ill-gotten gain. For it is lawful to be rich, but not with covetousness, with rapine and violence, and a bad name among all men."

It is a matter of some importance, certainly of great curiosity, to know how an ancient Greek interpreted those expressions in the Greek Testament which to us appear ambiguous. Let us notice a few instances.

---

\* In justice to the Christian orator, we have felt bound to depart from the translation and to strive to approach a little nearer to the spirit of the original.

1 Cor. II, v. 13. "But what is this, comparing spiritual things with spiritual? When a thing is spiritual, and of dubious meaning, we adduce illustrations from things which are spiritual."

Chap. II, v. 15. "*He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.*" For so he that has sight himself beholds all things, even such as pertain to the man that has no sight; but no sightless person discerns what the other does. So also in the case before us, our own matters and those of unbelievers we know; but ours they know not."

Chap. V, vs. 7, 8. "*For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast.*" So also Christ called his doctrine leaven. The writer dwells upon the metaphor, reminding them of ancient events, and of the Passover, and unleavened bread. Therefore the whole time in which we live is a festival. For he said, *Let us keep the feast*, not with a view to the presence of the Passover or of Pentecost, but as pointing out the whole life as a festival unto Christians, because of the excellency of the good things which have been given."

Chap. XV, v. 29. "*Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?*" What is it that he means? Or shall I first mention how they who are infected with the Marcionite heresy pervert this expression? I know, indeed, that I shall excite much laughter. When any catechumen dies among them, having placed a living man under the couch of the dead, they approach the corpse, and talk with him, and ask him if he wishes to receive baptism; then, when he makes no reply, he that is concealed beneath says, in his stead, that he should wish to be baptized; and so they baptize him, instead of the departed, like men jesting upon the stage.—What, then, is Paul speaking of? First I wish to remind you who are initiated, of the response which they who introduce you to the mysteries bid you make, and then I will explain the words of Paul.—When we are about to baptize, we bid the candidate say, *I believe in the resurrection of the dead*; and upon this faith we are baptized. After we together with the rest have confessed this, we are let down into the fountain of those sacred streams. Reminding them of this, Paul said, *If there be no resurrection, why art thou baptized for the dead?* that is, the dead bodies. For with a view to this art thou baptized, believing the resurrection of the dead body, that it shall not remain dead. Thou by thy *words* [of confession] declarest the resurrection of the dead; but the priest, as by an image in the act itself, represents to thee what thou hast believed and confessed." Notwithstanding the objection which may be urged against this interpretation, that the word *ὑπὲρ* signifies *for the benefit of* (the dead), the general view of Chrysostom has, in our opinion, fewer difficulties by far than that of De Wette, Bretschneider, Rückert and Meyer, and many before them, according to which the apostle alluded to a supposed superstition among the Corinthians, the remains of which are to be seen among the Marcionites and the Corinthians. Theodoret, commenting on the passage, says: "He who is baptized is buried with the Lord, in order that, by participating in his death, he may also be partaker in the resurrection. But if the body is dead, and rises not, why then is one baptized?" So most of the Greek fathers.

We doubt not that many of our readers, whatever be their views in regard to the Christian way of treating slavery,—a subject which, so

far as it is a party question, it is the settled policy of this journal not to discuss,—will be desirous of knowing how Chrysostom explains Chap. VII, v. 21. He paraphrases and expounds the passage thus:

“*Let every one abide in the same calling wherein he was called.* Hast thou been called, having an unbelieving wife? Continue to have her. Cast not out thy wife for the faith’s sake. Hast thou been called, being a slave? Care not for it. Continue to be a slave. Hast thou been called, being in uncircumcision? Remain uncircumcised. Didst thou become a believer, being circumcised? Continue circumcised. For this is the meaning of the words, *as God hath distributed unto every man.* For these are no hindrances to piety. Thou art called, being a slave; another, with an unbelieving wife; another, being circumcised. Astonishing! where has he put slavery? As circumcision profits not, and uncircumcision does no harm, so neither does slavery, nor yet liberty. And that he might point out this with surpassing clearness, he says, *But even if thou canst become free, use it rather;* that is, rather continue a slave. Now upon what possible ground does he tell the person who might be set free, to remain a slave? He means to point out that slavery is no harm, but rather an advantage. Now we are not ignorant that some say the words, *use it rather*, are spoken with regard to liberty; interpreting it, *if thou canst become free, become free.* But the expression would be very contrary to Paul’s manner, if he intended this. For he would not, when consoling the slave, and signifying that he was in no respect injured, have told him to get free.—Next he adds the cause: *For he that is called in the Lord, being a slave, is the Lord’s free man: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ’s servant.* For, he says, in the things that relate to Christ, both are equal; and as thou art the slave of Christ, so is thy master. How, then, is the slave a free man? Because he has freed thee, not only from sin, but also from outward slavery, continuing a slave. For he suffers not even a slave to be a slave, though he be a man abiding in slavery; and this is the great wonder. But how is the slave a free man, while continuing a slave? When he is freed from passions, and the diseases of the mind; when he looks down upon riches, and wrath, and all like passions.—But if this be not the meaning, if he bade them forsake their masters, and strive contentiously to become free, in what sense did he exhort them, saying, *Let every one remain in the calling in which he is called?* And, in another place, *As many servants as are under the yoke, let them count their own masters worthy of all honor; and those that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren who partake of the benefit.* And, writing to the Ephesians, also, and Colossians, he ordains and exacts the same rules. Whence it is plain, that it is not this slavery which he annuls, but that which, caused as it is by vice, befalls free men also.—Such a thing is Christianity; in slavery to bestow freedom.—But if it is impossible for one who is a slave to be a Christian, such as he ought to be, the Greeks will condemn true religion of great weakness; whereas, if they can be taught that slavery in no way impairs godliness, they will admire our doctrine. For if death hurt us not, nor scourges, nor chains, much less slavery.—Art thou in bondage to a man? Why, thy master also is a slave to thee, in arranging about thy food, in taking care of thy health, and clothes, and in looking after thy shoes, and all the other things. And thou

dost not fear so much lest thou shouldst offend thy master, as he fears lest any of those necessaries should fail thee. ‘But he sits down, while thou standest.’ And what of that? since this may be said of thee, as well as him. Often, at least, when thou art lying down, and sleeping sweetly, he is not only standing, but undergoing endless discomforts, in the market-place, and he lies awake more painfully than thou.”

But as Chrysostom is here speaking chiefly of the *religious* interest of the slave, it is necessary to hear him in his address to the master. He severely rebukes the pomp and display of a retinue of slaves, at the close of his fortieth homily, on Chap. XV, v. 34.

“For why hath he many servants? Since as in our apparel we ought to follow our need only, and in our table, so also in our servants. What need is there, then? None at all. For, in fact, one master need only employ one servant; or rather two or three masters one servant.—For God hath made men sufficient to minister unto themselves, or rather unto their neighbor also. And if thou believe it not, hear Paul saying, *These hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that are with me.* After that he, the teacher of the world, and worthy of heaven, disdained not to serve innumerable others, dost thou think it a disgrace, unless thou carriest about whole herds of slaves?—Since not on account of any need was the class of slaves introduced, else even along with Adam had a slave been formed; but it is the penalty of sin, and the punishment of disobedience. But when Christ came, he put an end also to this. *For in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free.* So that it is not necessary to have a slave; or if it be at all necessary, let it be but one only, or at the most two. What mean the swarms of servants? For as the sellers of sheep, and the slave-dealers, so do our rich men take their round, in the baths and in the forum. However, I will not be too exact. We will allow you to keep a second servant. But if thou collect many, thou doest it not for humanity’s sake, but in self-indulgence. Since if it be out of concern for them, I bid thee occupy none of them in ministering to thyself, but, when thou hast purchased them, and hast taught them trades whereby to support themselves, let them go free. But when thou scourgest, when thou puttest them in chains, it is no more a work of humanity. I know I am giving disgust to my hearers. But what must I do? For this I am set, and I shall not cease to say these things, whether any thing come of them or not.” The curious reader will find him speaking in a strain similar to what we have quoted from the volumes before us, in his fifteenth and twenty-second homilies, on Ephesians, his sixth, on Lazarus, his second and forty-fifth, on Acts, and his fourth, on Titus.

But we must close this notice, after recommending these two volumes, as the most important which have yet appeared in the series, unless we make an exception in favor of Augustine’s *Confessions*. We regret that the Oxford mania for an antiquated and clumsy style has infected these volumes also. Why should Chrysostom be stripped of his rich, glowing and splendid style? It is a mistake, to suppose that he will appear more venerable in a homely, antiquated garb, than in the flowing and graceful robe of Burke or Robert Hall. Chrysostom, were he now living, would sooner flee into the wild mountains of Isauria or

Colchis, than speak in such language as Messrs. Cornish and Medley have in some instances put into his mouth.\* And yet the English of this translation is far better than that of Augustine's Confessions. The translation is in general tolerably accurate, though the ideas of the author appear frequently more correctly conceived than faithfully conveyed.† There would seem to be not so much a want of learning, as of judgment and skill. The sentences, also, are so constructed as not only to appear awkward, but to destroy all oratorical effect. More particularly are the particles, which are frequently the hinges on which whole sentences turn, found out of joint, or so uselessly and cumbrously attached as to require removal.

2. *Die Beredsamkeit einer Tugend, oder Grundlinien einer systematischen Rhetorik.* Von D. FRANZ THEREMIN. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Berlin. 1837. i. e.,

*Eloquence a Virtue, or Outlines of a System of Rhetoric.* By Dr. FRANCIS THEREMIN. 12mo., pp. 206.

The author of this little work—court preacher at Berlin—is well known as one of the most eloquent evangelical preachers of Germany. It has been truly remarked that, in his religious character, he resembles Thomas à Kempis and Fenelon, though, in decision and boldness, as well as oratorical power, he is more like Massillon. He has published several volumes of sermons, part of which, under the title of "Cross of Christ," have been translated into English. The first edition of his work on rhetoric was printed in 1814. Its most distinguishing feature is, that it makes the fundamental principle of eloquence to consist in *character*; or, in the language of the author, "eloquence, in its highest principles, must be considered as entirely distinct from art and philosophy, and as being a purely moral exercise." He remarks, by way of explanation, "this was no new discovery of mine. \* \* \* On the contrary, similar views of others have been quoted in many places in the following work. \* \* \* What is new and peculiar in my views is this, that I have elevated this acknowledged truth to the rank of the highest principle of eloquence, and have attempted to derive the rules of the latter from that principle alone, to the exclusion of all others." Consequently, a negative Rationalist cannot be an eloquent preacher, in the true sense of the term; and the best means to be employed by a young man for the attainment of this high end, is the thorough cultivation of his highest, that is his moral, powers. Christian wisdom and heroism, moral sublimity of character, will do more towards giving power to a man's words than all art and science.

\* We allude to such phrases as "brimful of evils," "like as when," "quit of accounts to be given," "pangs of the belly" [hunger], "the devil's great heap of garbage," "or if whether on the contrary."

† The following example may serve as an illustration: "For not he that baptizeth, but he who is called unto the baptism, is the subject of inquiry." What English reader would suppose that "he who is called unto the baptism" means Christ, in whose name persons were baptized?

We are pleased to see such sentiments avowed and maintained by a man whose life and success are the best comment upon his words. We may have much to object to the *form* in which he explains his theory, and to the exclusiveness of his favorite principle. We regard it as an exaggeration. But, although he makes moral excellence the highest principle of the art (for we have not yet learned to say *virtue*), and claims that it gives to the preacher his chief power, he finds, in a subordinate rank, a place for all the other qualifications that are ordinarily insisted on.

His first chapter is on the object and utility of the proposed investigation. Here he anticipates objections. "What," it will be said, "was ever effected by theories? \* \* Did not eloquence reach its highest perfection among the ancients, with whom, as with us, its highest principle was either unknown, or loosely floating before the mind? It was only by the observance of rules drawn from experience, and relating to particular points, by untiring effort in exercise from youth up, not by theories, that Demosthenes and Cicero became what they were. It is only in the same way, not by books, that our sunken eloquence is to be raised, if it is to be raised at all." To which he replies: "These objections would be perfectly valid, if eloquence had not, since the introduction of Christianity, assumed an entirely new form, unknown to the ancients. \* \* He who was pleading before a court or addressing a political body, saw in the immediate result whether he had been successful or not in his effort. When the most important personal interests were at stake, when want of success would bring with it the loss of property, influence, freedom, or life itself, it was natural that nothing should be left untried. The pulpit orator stands in a very different relation to his hearers, and treats of subjects that can never be brought to such an immediate test. Whether he has imparted instruction, edification and improvement, or has merely bestowed momentary pleasure, and excited superficial feeling, cannot be ascertained by obvious results, since these are in their nature concealed in mental operations that are rarely observable. \* \* Since his limits are not so definitely fixed as those of a pleader, he must have settled principles to guide him, and to keep him from wandering, and a deeper insight into the ultimate laws of eloquence than the ancients, with their distinct objects before them, required."

He regards his theory of eloquence as the only one that can abide the assaults which the ablest of men have been led to make upon the art itself. These men object, that its aim is to operate upon the passions, and that, with the best orators, the obvious and acknowledged design of speaking is to master the mind, to control the will, and guide it at pleasure; that there is an impropriety if not immorality in such a procedure; that one ought to deal only with the understanding, and satisfy that by rigid demonstration, and omit all appeal to the passions. "I must confess," says Kant, "that a fine poem always gives me pleasure; whereas the perusal of the best productions of a Roman, or a parliamentary, or pulpit orator always awakens feelings of displeasure; because I there see in practice the art of moving men, on grave subjects, like machines, and bringing them to a conclusion which loses its importance upon cool reflection. Eloquence, as an art for turning the

weakness of men to our own account—and such it is, in reality, however good our designs may be—is deserving of no confidence.”\*

The object of the second and third chapters is to show that eloquence is neither philosophy, nor poetry, nor something intermediate. It has three characteristics; first, it is related to philosophy; secondly, it is related to poetry; thirdly, it aims at some practical object out of itself, and is hereby distinguished from both philosophy and poetry. One of these three must be made the highest principle of eloquence (if we have any such), and the others must be made subordinate. This pre-eminence can be given only to the third characteristic, for the other two are concerned only with the complete and symmetrical development of an idea, which can never be the chief characteristic of eloquence. This is always relative, has regard to men and to circumstances, and is, in fact, a part of conduct, a moral act, and comes under the same rule with other human actions. Hence, the author maintains, in chapter fourth, that true eloquence, the only kind that can be defended, is a *virtue*. Its design is to effect a change in other men's views and actions, and the chief inquiry, which it ought to propound at the outset, is, ‘*According to what principle is one human being allowed to act upon the mind of another?*’ and this is a moral question. If all the rules of eloquence may be derived from the laws according to which one human being ought to act upon the mind of another, then rhetoric, as the theory of eloquence, will be seen to be a part of ethics, and eloquence itself to be an art which is to be governed by ethical laws, or, in other words, it is a virtue. In all this, it is not meant that a certain amount of moral excellence is of itself sufficient to make an orator, irrespective of art and science and learning; but that an ethical principle is to be made the organic principle, which shall determine what parts and proportions eloquence is to borrow from these other sources. And that is the proper office of the highest principle in any science. It is a regulative principle. In eloquence, as concerned with our relations to others, our objects and aims and all our social influence, it is the supreme judge, and must control the exercises of the art in all its branches.

But how is this general principle to be applied in eloquence? The orator has certain views and plans which he wishes to see carried into execution; and to attain his end, it is necessary that he arouse those that are indifferent and give them a right impulse, and that he overcome opposers, and carry them with him. But he must use no compulsion; he is not a lawgiver, nor a ruler; he must stand on a level with his hearers, and respect their rights and liberties. Those who listen must be independent, and must follow their own will. How, then, shall the speaker accomplish his object? He must bring his own views into contact with the universal principles recognized by his hearers, and show their harmony, and then his work is done. His own duty has

---

\* So Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III, 1. “As the whole of the rhetorical art relates merely to opinion, it is to be practised rather as a matter of necessity than of right.” In the *Dial. de Caus. Cor. Eloq.*, it is called, *alumna licentiae, quam stulti libertatem vocant, comes seditionum, effrenati populi incitamentum, sine obsequio, sine servitute, contumax, temeraria, arrogans.*

been performed and the freedom of his hearers has not been infringed. Those universal principles, found among all men, may be reduced to ideas of *duty, virtue* and *happiness*. Men are to be shown what their relations to others require of them, what is noble, and what their true interests demand ; these are the motives to action ; and true freedom on the part of the hearer consists in an unhesitating compliance with them. In one's civil relations, law and right, and the pursuit of the public good, will be found to be the means of personal happiness ; in one's relations to God and another world, likeness to God and to Christ. In such a view there will appear to be no *essential* difference between secular and sacred eloquence.

It is not only morally right, but it is also wise, that an orator be governed by this principle ; else ethics are taught to but little purpose. If there be a rhetorical wisdom which contradicts the moral law, that wisdom deserves not the name of science. But if genuine eloquence consists in tracing our views to the general ideas of duty, virtue, and the true interests of men as they are recognized in society, how can it be wise for the orator to contravene any of these laws ? But, it will be said, 'the orator must appeal to the passions, turn them to his account where they exist, and excite them where they do not. Will not a skilful orator, who deals with the passions, always gain the victory over the unskilful one who deals with ideas of morality only ? That is not the way to state the case. Let the two men be of equal talent and skill,' says our author in substance, and we maintain that the one who seizes on the principles of our higher nature, and takes his position on the ground of right, will, in the end, always prevail over the other who places his confidence in the weaknesses of men, and plays dishonest tricks with them. And there are two reasons for this ; first, the ideas of right and wrong are permanent in the minds of men, whereas passions are temporary ; and secondly, those ideas of right and wrong are uniform in all men, whereas passions are very different in different individuals. It is honorable to our nature, that, however much may be effected in small assemblies by artifice, in great assemblies orators must be men of great and noble sentiments, or their failure is certain. Even unprincipled men must feign morality, if they would succeed. Here lies the secret of Demosthenes's great power,—in his noble and magnanimous sentiments. It is easy to appear honest, and make a good impression, if one is so in reality ; but it is hard to deceive men on such a point. Which of the two characters here contemplated has the advantage in conciliating the good-will of his hearers ? This difference will explain the philosophy contained in Rousseau's advice to de Mauleon, a young, but afterwards celebrated French lawyer, which was, 'never to undertake a cause of whose justice he was not well convinced.'

There are three obstacles which may stand in the way of the orator ; first, confused ideas in regard to duty, virtue and happiness ; secondly, a doubt of their applicability in a particular instance, arising from ignorance of circumstances and relations ; thirdly, there may be another way of explaining things, or a doubt of the reality of what is declared, all which are to be overcome by explaining principles, by illustrating their practicability in the case contemplated, and by pointing out clearly the necessary connection of cause and effect, or the reality of what is affirmed. It is obvious, that mere moral qualities will not enable one

to do all this; he must have a disciplined, and philosophical, and well-furnished mind. Why then refer them to an ethical principle? Because that principle will *require* him to explain all these things just as they are; and furthermore require of him to ascertain the truth, and obtain the requisite knowledge before he venture upon the explanation.

In regard to *truth*, eloquence is not concerned directly with it as such; this is the province of philosophy; but with it only so far as one's object requires the discussion of principles, or as morality makes it a law. Of course, the pulpit orator has more frequent occasion to resort to such discussions than the parliamentary orator, as his object is not merely to secure a specific act, but to change the whole moral character.

How is the orator to establish truth? Not with philosophic completeness, not with long deductions from abstract principles. For in such a case the practical interest, which must always be chief, would be greatly weakened, if not destroyed. Here, then, is a difficult problem to be solved, viz., how to establish truth, without philosophic demonstration. First, the author remarks, there are many truths, which need no such demonstration, but are received upon a clear statement or illustration. Secondly, many may be settled by authority, either that of the hearers or that of others. The former occurs when the speaker shows his hearers that the denial of his position would stand in contradiction with what is acknowledged by them on other subjects. Such a method has this to recommend it, that people are hereby led on by their own principles, and character is developed from an inward germ, rather than patched up with something foreign to it. Thus the orator can be surer of success, as well as effect more good, by attaching himself to the truth that is scattered among the multitude, and raising this to its highest power, instead of spinning out an abstract system of his own, that is foreign to their minds. When neither of these methods can be applied, then he must resort to other authority, human or divine. The opinion of a learned profession, or of a man of acknowledged wisdom, is often appealed to with the happiest effect. The pulpit orator resorts continually to the authority of Scripture, which has a better effect than a long train of reasoning, even on those subjects where reason itself could form some conclusions. How much dignity and power does a preacher lose when he presents his own reasonings and speculations instead of the messages of God! Contrast the ablest dialectician exhibiting his philosophical discussions in the pulpit, with a preacher of ordinary talent, but strong faith and ardent piety, who boldly preaches to high and low with the authority of an ambassador of God. "To those who would rival the political eloquence of the Greeks, and speak from the pulpit with Demosthenian power, I would say; science, knowledge, style, delivery,—these all will aid you, but they will not make you an orator. Demosthenes was an orator by means of the greatness and firmness of his character, and these qualities are indispensable to you; but they are not enough. After the highest attainable perfection, you are still encompassed with human weaknesses; and who gave you authority to deal out salvation or damnation to those who are no worse than yourselves? This you will feel, and will not dare to address them with power, and will satisfy yourself with gently moving their feelings, or entertaining them with new and ingenious thoughts, and may, perhaps, for a time be popular with the multitude; but a lasting, endless

fame, arising from a perpetuated beneficial influence, will not be yours. You are weak and timid, so long as you rely upon yourselves; venture to appear as the servants and instruments of God, and you will be filled with courage and power. Faith will make you firm and secure, you will teach with authority as did Jesus; he spoke his Father's words, you speak his. Take these words of his as did the apostles. You will soon believe that all the power of sacred eloquence lies concealed in the authoritative teaching of the word of God."

The second object to be secured by an orator, the conviction of the *practicability* of any enterprise, he illustrates in the case of Demosthenes, with whom it was no small object to show that successful resistance to Philip was practicable. But even this was subordinate to the moral aim, the good of the state. The same thing is highly necessary to the pulpit orator, in order to show that the duties enjoined by the gospel are practicable, and that all excuses are vain. This requires the greatest practical knowledge and skill, but is one of the most powerful weapons of the preacher, if he only know how to wield it.

The third object to be attained, proving the *reality* of what is affirmed, establishing the fact and its connection with a conceded principle, is in the highest requisition in judicial pleading, as in a case of murder. But here also there must be a controlling ethical principle. The idea of justice lies at the foundation of the whole proceeding. In pulpit eloquence this stands closely connected with the first object above mentioned, because in Christianity principles and facts, as in the case of the love of God and redemption, are inseparable.—(Chapters 4—12.)

We pass over the thirteenth chapter, "on the plan and division of a discourse," with the single remark, that its only peculiarity is its rare excellence. In the next chapter, containing a description of an orator, the author comes back to a capital point in his theory. We give his words in part: "The description is the more necessary, since otherwise it might appear as though a mere knowledge of our rules and a skilful observance of them were enough, without regard to moral character. Such a view would overthrow our theory, which makes rhetoric a part of the ethical science. But it is not so; and the observance of these canons without the moral power of character, without virtue, and, in the case of the pulpit orator, without a spiritual life of faith, is impossible. For an orator's work consists in directing the mind; and to this work he is not competent, if he have not a clear view of the end to which he would direct it, and if he do not burn with a sincere and ardent desire to secure his object. In a word, he must be in possession of great moral principles; and these belong to character. The imagination is, indeed, the generator of those ideas from which the creations of art spring, although it seems to me that these ideas will be insecure and fluctuating when unsupported by character. But eloquence, as it has to do with the will, so it proceeds from the will. Take the case of a pulpit orator. Where will he find the materials for his discourses, if he do not feel a deep and solemn concern in his own religious character, and in the moral condition of others, if he have not a strong desire to produce reformation? He only, who is inspired with these sentiments, who is laboring for his own religious culture, and concerns himself with the moral state of other men only for their highest good, can have within himself a full supply of those moral ideas and principles which have the greatest power in controlling the human will."

His ethical principle is applied with admirable effect, as a test of the passions which the orator has a right to employ in his service. There are two kinds of excitement to which the mind is subject; that produced by outward circumstances, a momentary passion, which disturbs the judgment, and ought to be avoided by the orator,—and that which arises from the contemplation of what is noble, true and good, an affection which never blinds and misleads, but guides while it ennobles, which is not a consuming fire, but a sunbeam having more light than heat, an ardor of feeling allied with all that is noble in art and commanding in virtue;—this is the kind of passion of which the orator is to avail himself. This was the chief element of the power of Demosthenes, and had he written a treatise on rhetoric, it would not have been degraded by the tricks played upon the vulgar passions of men as some parts of Cicero's writings are.

Having shown that genuine excitement, that which is produced and sustained by principle, is never objectionable, he now goes a step farther, and maintains, that this is essential to the orator, and that he ought never to speak without it. For he comes before an assembly for the very purpose of imparting a sentiment with which his own soul is filled. If there be no ardor in the speaker, it is fair to infer that his own mind is not possessed of the subject,—that professing to have some purpose to effect, and having nothing definite burdening his mind, he is merely yielding to professional duty, is a hireling, or an intriguer, or a flourishing and frosty rhetorician. Such a man cannot find his way to the bosoms of the people.

With the exception of the succeeding chapter, in which the author gives a psychological view of the passions, associating them all with ideas of duty, virtue and happiness, and distinguishing those which an upright orator may use, from those which he may not, the remainder of the book contains little but what may be found in other good works on the subject.

No very great alteration has been made in the body of the work in this second edition; but an interesting essay of thirty-two pages, in the form of a preface, is prefixed to it, containing many valuable remarks on the application of the principles discussed in the work to the art of preaching in particular. However we may accuse our author of *one-sidedness* in his theory, we must acknowledge that the work abounds in views and sentiments worthy of his name, in a manner, too, that admirably illustrates the rules of the art. Indeed, if one is familiar with this treatise, he will not be much surprised that it has been pronounced “a production which has created an epoch in the history of homiletics.”\*

3. *Notes; Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*; with a new translation, by ALBERT BARNES. In three vols., 8vo. pp. 517, 438, 770. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1840.

This commentary is as good as it well could be with the philological attainments of the author, and the amount of labor bestowed upon its preparation. The chief alteration that we should desire, would be the reduction of its bulk. We do not see the necessity of occupying so

\* Conversations-Lexicon of the Most Recent Times and Literature, vol. IV, p. 816.

much space with double translations, or of introducing so much common matter from the Hebrew Lexicon. Nor can we approve of the method of introducing a homiletic diffuseness of style into a critical commentary. The plain truth is, a learned man does not need so much popular remark, and an unlearned man is neither pleased nor edified with so many Hebrew words, even though the *pronunciation* is given in Roman letters. With these abatements, which relate to the plan of the work quite as much as to the execution, the commentary before us may be recommended to a certain class of ministers. They will here find a useful collection of criticisms, historical notices, comments and remarks.

4. *Lexicon Manuale Graeco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti. Auctore C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER.* Editio Tertia emadata et aucta. In one volume, quarto. Leipsic. 1840.

The Lexicon of Bretschneider is as yet the best in regard to questions of pure philology of any that we have on the New Testament. In this new edition, the author has not only re-examined the Greek writers in the common dialect, the study of which gave such value to the former edition, but has extended his reading to others. He has also labored, and not without success, we think, to carry the grammatical principles adopted by Winer in his New Testament Grammar, into more rigid execution than in the previous editions. Another improvement is the omission of those leading tenses which school lexicons give to all verbs whether they occur in authors or not, and the substitution of all the forms of the verb which actually occur in the New Testament. Many of the articles have been prepared entirely anew; others have been corrected, enlarged, or otherwise improved, as each case required. That in regard to certain words which express the nature of Christian principles, there should be some deficiency and error in Bretschneider in consequence of his theological views, is a matter of course. It is impossible, in the very nature of the case, that a Rationalist should make a lexicon of the New Testament all that it ought to be. For this reason the lexicon of Dr. Robinson can be more safely put into the hands of the young student.

5. *The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation from the coming of Julius Caesar into this Island, till the year of our Lord 731.* By VENERABLE BEDE. Carefully revised and corrected from the translation of Mr. STEVENS, by the Rev. J. A. GILES, LL. D., to which are added a life of the author, a map, a chronological chart, notes, &c. Octavo. pp. 377. London. 1840.

The examination of this beautiful volume has given us rare pleasure; every thing pertaining to it is executed in a finished and scholar-like manner. The translation is a model of the right style of composition for such productions. The notes, which occupy twenty-four pages, are mostly of an antiquarian character.

As Bede is the standard author on the early ecclesiastical history of England, all who are particularly interested in church history, will naturally desire to read the work itself rather than the gleanings from it by other writers. In this, too, they will be favored by the moderate

cost of the translation, the original being a very expensive folio volume. Nothing can give one so true a picture of those early times as the productions of the age itself. In them one sees the scenery with his own eyes, and becomes familiar with it without effort; in modern authors, he has nothing but a general and almost necessarily vague description of it. The very weaknesses of the venerable monk, himself towering far above his age, are highly instructive; they constitute a part, and a valuable part, of history.

Bede is chiefly attractive on account of his piety and his learning. In him we see the Roman and monastic piety of that age in its best form; in him also we find a living encyclopedia of the learning of his times. He had read much; he possessed the talent of imbibing the spirit of what he found in cumbrous volumes, and of giving it out in a better form. His mind was free from confusion; his knowledge well arranged; and his language well chosen, clear and flowing. But we must not suppose that he had a very profound intellect, or that he was an original thinker. He was rather a mirror that reflected the images of other minds. Bede, it is well known, was attached to the Roman party, and would not, of course, say all that might have been said in favor of the old British, Irish and Welsh Christians, who resisted the authority of Gregory the Great and his band of missionary monks.

6. *Causes of the Prevalent Failures in Pulpit Eloquence.* An Address delivered before the Rhetorical Society of the Baptist Theological Institution, in Thomaston, Me., Aug. 5, 1840. By JOHN WAYLAND, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Salem, Mass. Boston. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1840.

The author of this pamphlet has expressed his views in a clear and forcible manner. His leading suggestions are just and appropriate. Yet we confess we have a less unfavorable opinion than is here presented of the actual state of pulpit eloquence. Clearly, however, preachers need incitement and instruction. It is well to seek out the causes of the oft-lamented failures in the oratory of the pulpit. This address selects four:—1. The inherent difficulty that exists in the art itself.—2. The inadequate impression among students of the important influence of sacred rhetoric upon other branches of study.—3. The low aims of the sacred orator.—4. The excitable character of the present age. From many forcible and interesting paragraphs, we select the following as eminently appropriate to the author's purpose:

"Were I called upon to specify the chief cause of the failures in pulpit eloquence, my reply would be, poverty of invention. It is this which renders sermons so trite and commonplace, confines the intellect to a few hackneyed topics, and spreads over every discussion an air of sameness. Let me not, however, be understood to intimate that we should be employed in discovering new truths, to the neglect of the established doctrines of Scripture. I am not speaking of *discovery*, but of *invention*; between which there is a wide difference. I suppose the truths of religion to remain the same, while the *mode* of presenting these truths may be endlessly diversified. The invention is exercised, not in finding out new doctrines, but in opening new sources of argument in proof of those doctrines, seizing upon fresh illustrations, and presenting

various combinations of motives. The lawyer does not discover new principles of law. These remain the same whenever he rises to address court or jury. Still, ample room is left him for the exercise of his invention, in combining these principles into new trains of argument, and adapting them to the facts of the case. It is this effort that rouses his mind, and excites its original powers to exertion. In like manner, while the doctrines of Scripture remain unalterable, invention may be exercised, in ranging over every field of thought, and gathering from thence proofs, illustrations and persuasives, for the purpose of illuminating and convincing the understanding, kindling the imagination, and quickening the conscience. Under the influence of such new conceptions, the pulse of an audience cannot beat languidly. Their minds will be roused, their interest secured, their attention arrested, and the probability greatly increased, of their being brought to believe, and feel, and act. The same truths, being presented in aspects constantly diversified, will be seen by the hearers in new lights, and lead them with eagerness to press forward in knowledge."—pp. 16, 17.

7. *The Books of the Old and New Testaments, Canonical and Inspired; with remarks on the Apocrypha.* By ROBERT HALDANE, Esq., of Scotland. First American Edition. With an Appendix. 18mo. pp. 191. Boston. Published by the American Doctrinal Tract Society, Perkins & Marvin, Agents. 1840.

Having long felt the need of a satisfactory work on the subjects here treated of, we took up this book with some degree of interest, though not with high expectation. The examination has convinced us that it is far from meeting the wants of the times. In the first place, the author is too warm a controversialist, and too intolerant a theologian. In the second place, he is master neither of his subject nor of its literature.

Part first, on the genuineness of the Holy Scriptures, is divided into three chapters, 1. the Old Testament, a mere popular outline, of seventeen pages; 2. the Apocrypha, treated in a similar way, in twenty-two pages; 3. the New Testament, to which the author properly devotes more space. A part of this chapter is very good, and the subject well treated. In the latter part of it, where he maintains that the question of the canon is one of revelation, not of erudition, he slides over the main point, as in too many other cases, with a mere assertion, and then discusses with some ability minor questions on which there is little difference of opinion among orthodox theologians. It is, indeed, very obvious, that we are not to prove the inspiration of the Scriptures, sentence by sentence; but the question must turn, as the author maintains, on the book as a whole; or we would rather say, on the inspiration of the author, and then the genuineness and integrity of his writings. Mr. Haldane says; "The first churches received the New Testament Scriptures from the witnesses of the Lord, and thus had inspired authority for those books." Very well; but this is precisely the point to be *proved*, and not dismissed, as it is here, with an assertion. If we understand him,—for his statements are so general that we are left in doubt as to his precise meaning,—his theory is, that each writer informed those for whose immediate benefit his book was prepared, that it was inspired, and was designed for all Christians alike. Thus the

individual Christians and churches, who received such communications, were virtually commanded to circulate them. Whether this account be true or not, certainly it is destitute of historical proof. It must either rest upon *a priori* reasoning, or it must be inferred from the fact, that these writings were received and regarded as inspired by the first Christians. As to the former, we may as well dismiss it at once;—*a priori* reasoning will not establish a *fact*. In regard to the second, all the testimony of antiquity goes to show that those early Christians, whose writings have reached us, received the writings of the New Testament as inspired, not for the reasons assigned by Mr. Haldane, but on the ground of their *apostolical origin*. Again, he says; “Every thing that goes to unsettle the canons, goes to unsettle every doctrine contained in the canon.” We are far from wishing to see the canon unsettled; but we are as far from *taking for granted* so fundamental a point as that the canon of the New Testament was *settled by revelation*. If this is not what the author means, he argues to no purpose; if he does mean this, we repeat, his assertion is incapable of proof.

A Catholic may receive the voice of his church as authority without inquiry for reasons; but we do not see how a Protestant can be denied the right of inquiring *historically*, what is Scripture. The only way of satisfying the mind of any critic on this subject, is to show that a book of the New Testament is directly or indirectly of apostolic origin. We can prove that the apostles were inspired, and therefore their sanction is all we need. Others of that age, as Mark and Luke, may have been equally inspired; their writings may be just as valuable as those of the apostles themselves; but *we have not the same proof* of it in any given case, and therefore need apostolic sanction. What the author affirms of the New Testament would, indeed, be true if affirmed of the Old. We have the testimony of Christ and the apostles to the inspiration of that collection *as a whole*; and here, and here only, can it be said that the removal of one book, which was really in that collection, would unsettle the whole canon. Not that the Old Testament has a better authority than the New, but that the course of proof, which is synthetic in the one case, is analytic in the other.

Part second, on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, is divided into four chapters, which with the appendix constitute about the half of the volume. We have much fault to find with his treatment of this subject, but cannot descend to notice all the particulars. In attempting to prove the inspiration of the New Testament, he does not begin at the right end. Instead of laying a strong historical basis, and arranging subsidiary and collateral proof in their proper place, he plunges at random into the subject, and gathers around him a complete chaos of evidence. On the subject of verbal inspiration, the chief difficulty his mind seems to labor under, arises from supposing that *necessarily*, in inspiration, the thoughts and words are *formally* dictated as if they came into the mind from without, instead of their springing up *in* a divinely illuminated and inspired soul. If the mind itself was inspired with the knowledge of any truth, all its intellectual acts, with reference to that truth, would naturally be under the influence of the same inspiration; it would, in that state, conceive of divine things (in just such a manner as God should lead it), arrange its thoughts, *and also select its language*. Is there any evidence that the written instruction of the apostles, was *in general*

inspired in a manner different from their oral instruction? Certainly the same promise was given in regard to both; and the apostle Paul always referred to his preaching as equally authoritative with his epistles. Nor have we the least intimation that his mind was in a different state when he was writing from what it was when preaching. Now, in his *general* course of inspired instruction (leaving out of view the case of visions and remarkable revelations), his thoughts and words do not seem to have had an external origin, but his inmost soul seems to have been made an inspired fountain from which the streams of thought and language issued. It is not our wish to insist on this view, nor do we suppose that the *matter* of inspiration is particularly affected by such nice questions in respect to the mode. What we would wish to represent is the *dogmatic spirit* with which our author maintains a mere hypothesis.

Many of the passages quoted in proof of verbal inspiration,—in which we ourselves are believers, in the sense above described,—have indeed some connection with the subject; but quite as many of them have no more to do with it than they have with the spots in the sun.

It is with true pleasure that we pass from the hazy atmosphere of the book to the pure and fresh air of the appendix by Dr. Woods. The latter is cool and collected, nice in his discriminations, and exact in his language. With a few exceptions, where we think either his analogy or his interpretation fails him, we could transfer his paragraphs to our creed. No language can better express our views than the following: “The sacred writers were so guided by the divine Spirit, that in every part of their work, they were rendered infallible, and wrote just what God willed they should write; so that the sacred volume entirely answers to the mind of God, and has nothing, either as to matter or form, which he did not see to be suited to the great object of a divine revelation.” We go farther, and fully agree with Dr. Woods in the statement that, “The general doctrine of inspiration, understood in any proper sense, seems clearly to imply, that the divine influence which the prophets and apostles enjoyed, must have pertained, in some way, to the manner in which they communicated divine truth. For can we suppose that God moved his servants to write a particular doctrine or fact, and yet did not influence them to write it in a suitable manner?—that, after prompting them to communicate something of consequence, he so abandoned them, that they were liable, as every man without divine assistance is, to fall into mistakes, or to make the communication in a manner less proper in itself, and less agreeable to the mind of God, than some other.”

8. *Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the Predictions of the Messiah by the Prophets.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG. Translated from the German, by REUEL KEITH, D. D., Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia. 3 vols., 8vo. pp. 560, 423, 499. Washington, D. C. W. M. Morrison. 1836, 1839.

Nothing is more difficult for journalists than to secure timely reviews of the most elaborate and valuable new works. If an editor would do any kind of justice to such books, he must limit his own labors to a few, and depend on his learned correspondents for the rest. But in so doing,

he becomes liable to various chances of disappointment or delay. Few *competent* men are willing to undertake the review of a great work; and when they have undertaken it, difficulty in the execution, other engagements, or feelings of modesty, make them slow in the performance. Such is our apology to the translator for neglecting till this late period to notice the Christology of Hengstenberg; and the same is due to some others for a similar neglect. In the mean time, until we can do better, we recommend this standard work to the biblical student. We do not indeed agree with the author in all he says; nor are we blind to the defects that attach to the character of his mind. But it is the chief production of a learned and able critic, to the preparation of which he devoted many of the best years of his life. In the later volumes, particularly, we discover proofs of a mature mind and mature scholarship. In fact, they constitute the best commentary we have on the minor prophets. The translator, too, so far as we have examined, has performed his part with accuracy and skill. The mistakes which we have discovered are too unimportant to be mentioned.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Miscellany from the German Papers.*—Tholuck, in his *Literary Index*, the first number of the present year, which is the tenth since the commencement of his journal, takes a retrospect of the last ten years, and compares the state of theology in 1830 with that of 1840. Then there were three schools, that of the ordinary Rationalists, that of the historical supernaturalists, and that of Schleiermacher. Then Schleiermacher stood on the “summit of the age” (*auf der Höhe der Zeit*), as it is called. He justified, in part, the attack of the Rationalists upon the old orthodoxy, but on the other hand, he condemned the spiritual barrenness of Rationalism. But his disciples could not remain on his middle ground; most of them left it and passed over to the evangelical party. Hegelianism then scarcely had an existence in theology. Now every thing is changed; the peculiar system of Schleiermacher has passed away, and Hegelianism stands on the “summit of the age.” “Eight years ago a friend of mine wrote to me expressing his surprise that the *Literary Index* should pay so much regard to the Rationalism of Röhr, and adding, “*in ten years Rationalism will be a dead dog, and Hegelianism will be ‘going about like a roaring lion.’*”

Even the political journals have called upon Tholuck to come out openly and declare whether he swears allegiance to the new philosophy or not. He refers them to his new work on “*Christian Devotion*,” as the best illustration of his position in theology, and says that he finds his honor, his strength and his consolation in the faith in which Luther, Calvin and Spener lived and died; a faith that is now branded by both the circumcised and the uncircumcised as *pietism*. While he abjures the

"extreme left" of Hegelianism, represented by Strauss and others who separate, in Christianity, doctrines from history, adopting the one and rejecting the other, and declines the honor of discipleship altogether, he believes that there are "depths in Hegelianism in which Christian truth can find a place," as is shown in Göschel's work, "the God-man," and still more in Dorner's "Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ" (1839). Tholuck avows his belief that theology and speculative philosophy cannot be separated; that theology is capable of justifying itself before reason, or rather showing itself as reason. Consequently theology must, in this world, always be, to some extent, fluctuating. Not that absolute truth is in itself variable, but that we never have any thing but an approximation to absolute truth, that we always see as through a glass darkly, and that these approximations must vary with the positions from which we take our view. The mind is always struggling to approach nearer to truth, to obtain better views. "This inward necessity, as my Berlin friends know, first drove me to Jacobi; afterwards the study of many of the scholastics, such as Thomas Aquinas, and Anselm, and especially some of the mystics, had an influence upon me, and later still, Schelling and Schleiermacher. Now I am brought to the study of Hegel; and I should feel that I was not discharging my duty as an academical teacher, were I not to struggle to become master of a system which is striking its roots so deep into the whole spirit of the age."

The gross pantheism of the more frivolous class of Hegelians, of which the writings of Heyne, and the most popular journals of elegant literature (such as the Freihafen, the Jahreszeiten, the Hamburg Jahrbücher der Literatur) are the representatives, is not so much a result of philosophy as a fruit of the impiety of the age. According to them, the only choice now left us is "between a headless faith and a faithless head." A short time since, it was a disgrace to speak in such a frivolous tone; now, it is the mode with those who boast of standing on "the summit of the age."

Thus the triumph which Christianity was gaining is deferred. The old Rationalism, which was going out of date, is uniting with the new philosophical party under the banner of Strauss, and recovering strength. The only difficulty with them lies in the undeniable fact, that the old Rationalists gave up the doctrines of the Bible and retained the historical facts, while Strauss and his party give up the facts and retain the doctrine—a rare union!

Still the religious energy of the Germans is much greater than it was ten years ago, although the friends of religion are divided into more parties than they were then. A new zeal is awakened in favor of the creeds, and a spirit of martyrdom is shown in favor of the old Lutheranism. It is to be regretted that the different parties of Christians pay so little regard to what they hold in common, and devote so much attention to points of difference.

Religion is sending forth a more commanding influence than formerly upon all the elements of society, and is affecting the most important events of the age. It has allied itself with *politics* as well as with the arts. In a part of Germany the government is maintaining Lutheranism; in other parts and in France the papal power is recovering strength; in England the Episcopal system is rigidly maintained; and in Russia a new zeal is awakened for the Greek church and a spirit of proselytism is revived.

The controversy about Rationalism and orthodoxy is assuming a more practical and personal character than formerly. There are three different, though connected, disputes on this general subject which seem to attract great public attention in Germany. The fundamental question is, 'Shall the public servants and ministers of the established church be required to preach according to the authorized creeds or not?' The orthodox take the affirmative, and the Rationalists the negative side of the question. The first controversy is of a somewhat personal character between Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin, and Prof. and Consistorial Counsellor, David Schulz of Breslau. The second originated in Altenburg, and was occasioned by Superintendent Hezekiel's requiring of the ministers under his charge to obligate themselves to adhere to the creeds. The third was occasioned in Hesse, by an order from the minister of state, according to which preachers were released from such obligation.

As it respects the first of these disputes, perhaps Hengstenberg was the aggressor. Prof. Schulz published a work on Faith, in 1834, and another on the Spiritual Gifts of Christians, in 1836, in which he spoke disparagingly of the creeds, and placed the educated preacher above their authority. Prof. Hengstenberg, in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, in 1838, reviewed these works, or rather their author, and criticised the public course of the *ecclesiastic*, more than he did the sentiments of the *writer*. The accusation is, that Dr. Schulz, in urging the strict men of the creed to retire from the Evangelical [*i. e.*, established Prussian] church, directly violates the principles established by the ecclesiastical authorities of the state, to which he himself, by virtue of his office, belongs; that his violent procedure is the cause, in part, of the secession of the orthodox, which recently took place in Silesia [Dr. Scheibel and his party]. This article of Prof. Hengstenberg called forth a volume of one hundred and seventy-nine pages from Dr. Schulz, in 1839, entitled the *Character and Conduct of the Berlin Evangelical Journal* [edited by Hengstenberg], illustrated by David Schulz, in which he begins with the childhood of Hengstenberg, follows him through the gymnasium and university, and gives the more edifying portion of his history up to the present time, in order to show that neither his learning, character, nor standing, qualifies him to be a public censor. Hengstenberg replied in his paper, and his reply was separately printed in a pamphlet of one hundred and ten pages. Both of the combatants are strong men, and skilled in the art of war; both are violent and intolerant; both are partly right and partly wrong. Therefore, we say, if they will fight, let them fight.

The second controversy is not limited to a few men, the extremes of opposite parties, but involves the whole body, inasmuch as the question is of such a nature, is so connected with the every day practice of the whole church, that every one must take some positive ground. Hence it happens, that there are thousands of voices graduated on the scale between the extremes of yes and no. The superintendent, supported by the consistory, took the position, that fidelity to his office required him to maintain the creed of the church, and presented as a special ground of urgency to duty, the fact, that many of the inhabitants of the Duchy of Altenburg had emigrated to America chiefly because they were obliged to sit under a Rationalist ministry.

As the question was one of the utmost intricacy and difficulty in the present state of the church, the opinion of the four theological faculties of Berlin, Göttingen, Jena and Heidelberg was requested, and the de-

cisions of these faculties were drawn up by professors Hengstenberg, Lücke, Hase and Umbreit respectively. Berlin heartily approved; Heidelberg loudly condemned in the spirit of Paulus; Göttingen and Jena replied moderately, holding a position midway between the other two.

In Hesse Cassel, where the question was differently decided by the public functionary, both parties, including lawyers, theologians and ministers, seized the pen, and every month the press sends forth a new book on the subject. We have before us the titles of no less than twenty-five books devoted to this controversy, and others we are informed are in a course of preparation. Such is the interest now felt, in the *creeds*, that even the Hebräist Hupfeld is preparing a new edition of the Augsburg Confession with a *commentary*!

The Basle Magazine of the most recent history of Evangelical missions is a substantial quarterly journal, recently conducted by the late Dr. Blumhardt, and is to be ranked among the most learned and excellent of missionary periodicals. The first number of the year 1837 is devoted to the biography of Carey, "who belongs to the first class of modern missionaries." The second number of the same year is wholly occupied with an account of the Burman empire. The third contains the annual report of the Missionary Society of Basle, and extracts from the journals and letters of missionaries. The fourth number contains the travels of Joseph Wolff through Central Asia, with a map and an estimate (not very high) of his labors. The first number of the next year, 1838, presents J. Williams's history of missions in the South Sea Islands; the second, the life of the Moravian missionary, David Zeisberger; the third, the annual report and appendices. There are one hundred alumni of the Institution now laboring among the heathen, and sixty persons still connected with the Institution. The closing number of 1838 gives an account of the travels and labors of the Methodist missionary, Stephen Ray, among the Caffres.

In the city of Berlin there are twenty-one German places of worship, containing twenty-five thousand seats, and accommodating (as most of the males stand) fifty-one thousand persons, or about one-sixth of the whole population. The largest of these accommodates four thousand persons, the five next three thousand five hundred each, the three next three thousand each, the average of the whole number of churches, a little more than two thousand and four hundred each.

#### AMERICA.

*New Books.*—Memoir of Rev. Luther Rice, one of the first American missionaries to the East, by James B. Taylor. The biographer appears to have done his work well.—Introduction to the French Language; comprising a French Grammar and a French Reader, with notes and a vocabulary, &c., by David Fosdick, Jr.—Airs of Palestine and other Poems, by John Pierpont.—The Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Adams, by her grandson, Charles Francis Adams. A second edition is in a course of preparation.—Foster's Essay on Living for Immortality, a new edition or rather reprint, in an improved form, of what appeared several years ago under the title of the Importance of Religion.—History of Baptism, from the inspired and uninspired writings, by Isaac Taylor Hinton.—The Young Mother's Delight in the Guidance of her Child's Intellect, by William Martin, editor of the London Educational Magazine. Also, the Duties of Mothers, by Rev. E. N. Kirk.

#### ENGLAND.

The Life and Times of S. Cyprian, by the Rev. George Aycliffe Poole, M. A.—Religion and Education in America; with notices of the state

and prospects of American Unitarianism, Popery and African Colonization, by John Dunmore Lang, D. D., senior minister of the Presbyterian Church in New South Wales, Principal of the Australian College. The author visited this country a year or two since, for the purpose of interesting the Presbyterian church in the South Sea mission. He appears to be a great admirer of the voluntary principle in support of religion, and, in some respects, at least, much more candid than most preceding travellers.—The Life of Martin Luther, by Gustav Pfizer, translated from the German, by Mr. Williams, teacher in Hamburg. The original is highly commended in Tholuck's Literary Index. It takes middle ground between the worshippers and the revilers of the Reformer.

The foundation-stone of the intended monument in Edinburgh to Sir Walter Scott, was laid Aug. 15. The building is to be one hundred and eighty feet high, and to cost £12,200, of which £2,200 are to be expended on the statue and pedestal.

#### GERMANY.

A new interest in the character and works of Schiller appears to be excited in Germany, particularly by *Schiller's Leben* or Life, written by the poet Gustav Schwaab.—Prof. Baumgarten-Crusius of Jena, has just published a Compend of the History of Christian Doctrines (*Compendium der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte*).—Prof. Bopp has commenced the publication of his great work, *Glossarium Sanscritum*, containing all the words in use compared with those of the Greek, Latin, German, Lithuanian, Sclavonic and Celtic Languages. Part I, quarto, has already appeared.—We notice the advertisement of J. Johnson's *Lexicon of the Biblical Hebrew*, with the *synonyms*.—W. Becker, author of *Gallus, or Roman Scenes in the Age of Augustus*, has issued another work on the same plan, entitled *Characles, or Pictures of Ancient Grecian Manners*, designed to illustrate the Private Life of the Greeks (*Bilder altgriechischen Sitte. Zur genaueren Kentniss des griechischen Privatlebens*), 2 volumes, with plates.—Homer is to be explained again, it seems; and in truth, a good commentary on the Iliad is needed. C. F. Stadelmann has put forth a volume of Notes, Grammatical and Critical to the Iliad of Homer (*Grammatisch-kritische Anmerkungen zur Ilias Homer. Für Schüler und Studirende, Leipsic*). As yet, the work only reaches through the first four books.—As this is the hundredth year since the death of Frederic the Great, the press is teeming with works relating to him. Preuss and Kugler have most distinguished themselves as his biographers. The work of the former is in nine vols. He judges quite otherwise of his hero than Lord Brougham has done.—The Life and Writings of Frederic III, with which the celebrated Prussian minister, von Altenstein was charged, have, since his death, been committed to Prof. Preuss.—A splendid work on the Costume of the Middle Ages of Christianity is in course of publication at Manheim, by von Hesner, assisted by several distinguished scholars.

*Death of Prof. Karl Otfried Mueller, of Goettingen.*—Prof. Müller died at Athens, Aug. 1, and was buried on a little hill above the Academy. He was taken ill at Delphi, where he was copying inscriptions. Mr. Curtius and Dr. Schöll of Berlin were with him. He intended, on his return to Germany, commencing his great work on the General History of Greece. He was but forty-three years of age, and yet how much has he done for Greek literature, history and antiquities. We notice also the death of Professor G. H. Schäfer of Leipsic, a veteran Greek scholar, and editor of many Greek and Roman classics.

## QUARTERLY LIST.

## DEATHS.

D. E. BURBANK, Winthrop, Me., Oct. 26.  
 ORSON CAMPBELL, Scott, N. Y., Oct. 19.  
 ROBERT T. DANIEL, Paris, Tenn., Sept. 14, aged 64.  
 JOHN DEW, Union Grove, St. Clair Co., Ill., Sept. 5.  
 JOSEPH DINSLAW, Topsham, Me., Oct. 20, aged 84.  
 ALANSON FISH, Ira, Vt., July 6.  
 NORVILLE GRANBURY, —, Miss., Aug. 28.  
 JAMESON HAWKINS, Indianapolis, Ia., Sept. 16, aged 73.  
 JONA HUMPHREYS, Butler Co., Pa., Aug. 3.  
 M. L. JONES, —, Va., Aug. 30.  
 JOHN W. KELLEY, Twigg Co., Ky., Aug. 17.  
 D. KNOWLES, Guilford, Mass.  
 SAMUEL LOVE, Knox Co., Tenn., Aug. 19.  
 WM. G. MONROE, Wilmington, Ia., Feb. 16.  
 ORNAN M. PETERSON, Perry Co., Ala., July 24.  
 RALPH M. PRENTISS, Vicksburgh, Miss., Aug. 28, aged 27.  
 SILAS STEARNS, Bath, Me., Aug. 1, aged 56.  
 JAMES THIGPEN, —, Miss., Aug. 23.  
 STEPHEN WALLER, —, Shelby Co., Ky., Sept. 11, "in a good old age."  
 LUMAN W. WEBSTER, Stockholm, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y., Aug. 5.

## ORDINATIONS.

ELISHA M. ALDEN, Cassewago, Crawford Co., Pa., Sept. 30.  
 EDMOND C. AMBLER, New Milford, Ct., Oct. 1.  
 RICHARD ANDERSON, Friendship Church, Bedford Co., Tenn.  
 O. W. BABCOCK, Enonburg, Vt., Sept. 24.  
 SAMUEL BAINBRIDGE, Stockbridge, N. Y., Sept. 15.  
 FRANKLIN J. BALDWIN, Harrison, Blackford Co., Ia., Sept. 1.  
 BARNEY BUCHANAN, Cool Branch Church, S. C., May 25.  
 HENRY D. BUTTOLPH, Iowa, Mich., Oct. 8.  
 ELISHA CUSHMAN, Willington, Ct., Sept. 30.  
 JOHN DAVIS, Ridgeway, Sullivan Co., N. Y., Aug. 15.  
 J. O. EDMANDS, Hartland, Niagara Co., N. Y., July 15.  
 JOSEPH FIELDING (Missionary), Philadelphia, July 23.  
 CHARLES W. FLANDERS, Beverly, Mass., Nov. 11.  
 DAVID FOOT, East Nassau, N. Y., Sept. 2.  
 FREDERIC FREEMAN, Westfield, Medina Co., Ohio, Oct. 22.  
 JAMES M. GRIFFIN, Providence, Pickens Co., Ala., Sept. 6.  
 ETHAN A. HADLEY, Tioga Co., Pa., June 24.  
 JOSIAH HALLOWELL, Patricktown, Me., Sept. 24.  
 J. M. HARRIS, Kennebunk, Me., Oct. 15.  
 WILLIAM HAWKINS, Bacon Creek, Hardin Co., Ky., Sept. 19.  
 JONATHAN HERRICK, Sharon, Vt., Sept. 11.  
 RUSSEL HOLMAN, Pitman's Creek, Green Co., Ky., July 29.  
 THOMAS HOLMAN, Jr., Southbridge, Mass., Sept. 6.  
 JOHN G. HOWARD, Owensboro', Tenn., Sept. 5.  
 THOMAS HOWARD, Shiloh, Alexander Co., Ill., July 5.  
 H. HUTCHINGS, Richfield, N. Y., Aug. 25.

THORNDIKE C. JAMESON, Providence, R. I., Nov. 5.  
 FRANCIS JONES, Leonard, Schoharie Co., Oct. 7.  
 WILLIAM W. LOVEJOY, Littleton, N. H.  
 ALVA LULL, Farmersville, N. Y., June 30.  
 J. M. MACE, Montville, Me., Sept. 8.  
 A. C. MALLORY, Dix, Steuben Co., N. Y., Sept. 30.  
 ISAAC MARVIN, Sherburne, N. Y., Sept. 1.  
 OEL W. MOXLEY, Parishville, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y., Oct. 1.  
 FRANKLIN MORRILL, Scarboro', Me., June 26.  
 REUBEN NEWTON, Westfield, Medina Co., Ohio, Oct. 22.  
 CHARLES OSBORNE, Scarborough, Me., Sept. 4.  
 ELIHU J. PALMER, Paddocks Prairie, Madison Co., Ill., Aug. 24.  
 TOBIAS PINKHAM, Lowell, Mass., Sept. 24.  
 — POND, Cowan's Creek, Clinton Co., Ohio, Sept.  
 JOSEPH PRICHARD, Charlotte, N. C., Sept. 6.  
 BENJAMIN RING, Nobleboro', Me., Aug. 19.  
 CHARLES SANDERSON, Portland, Chatauque Co., N. Y.  
 MATTHEW SEMPLE, Hatborough, Pa., July.  
 WILLIAM SMITH, Chelsea, Mass., Sept. 6.  
 ALFRED H. TAYLOR, Lansingburg, N. Y., Aug. 12.  
 PASCHAL H. TODD, Owenton, Ky., Oct. 9.  
 E. B. TURNER, Sunbury, Delaware Co., Ohio, Aug. 27.  
 ELISHA TUTTLE, Milesburg, Pa., Aug. 5.  
 THOMAS WAGGONER, Falmouth, Ky., Oct. 3.  
 JAMES WALKER, Albany, N. Y., Oct. 14.  
 PATRICK WARREN, Jr., Red Bank, Northampton Co., Va., Aug. 17.  
 A. WHITMAN, Stafford, Genesee Co., N. Y., Aug. 5.  
 LYMAN WHITNEY, Hinsdale, Cattaraugus Co., N. Y., Oct. 1.  
 JACOB WICKIZER, Daysville, Ill., May 21.  
 J. W. WILLIAMS, Royalton, Cuyahoga Co., Penn., Sept. 22.

## CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

In Salt Fork, Vermilion River, Ill., June 7.  
 In Alexander Co., Ill., July 28.  
 In Pleasant Grove, Marion Co., Ill., Aug. 1.  
 In Lowell, Mass., Aug. 2.  
 In Guilderland, N. Y., Aug. 4.  
 In Green Township, Wayne Co., Ohio, Aug. 23.  
 In Clear Spring, Taney Co., Mo., Aug. 28.  
 In Warsaw Creek, Miami Co., Ia., Aug. 30.  
 In Newcastle Township, Fulton Co., Ia.  
 In Belfast, Me., Sept. 5.  
 In Providence, R. I., Sept. 10.  
 In Jewett City, Conn., Sept. 15.  
 In Norwich, Conn., Sept. 22.  
 In Middletown, Orange Co., N. Y., Oct. 21.  
 In Boston, Mass., Nov. 5.  
 In Kensington, Penn., Oct.  
 In Duncan's Falls, Musc. Co., Ohio, Oct. 17.

## DEDICATIONS.

At Bethel, St. Clair Co., Ill., Sept. 5.  
 At New Berlin, N. Y., Sept. 10.  
 At Kennebunk, Me., Oct. 15.  
 At Vassalboro', Me., Oct. 22.  
 At Canton, Salem Co., N. Y., Oct. 29.  
 At Bowdoin Square, Boston, Nov. 5.  
 At Danville, Me., Nov. 11.

# I N D E X

T O

## CHRISTIAN REVIEW.....VOLUME V.

### A.

*Algic Researches*, by Schoolcraft, 474.  
*Anderson*, Dr. R., his missionary sermon, 138.  
*Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Hefele, 479.  
*Augustine*, his practical works, 64—*City of God*, 69—his *Confessions*, 74, 601—his *Doctrina Christiana*, 80—his talent, 67—interpretation of Scripture, 83.

### B.

*Bahrdt*, Dr., his character, 521.  
*Ballantine*, his Christmas address, 133.  
*Barnes*, Rev. A., his *Notes on Isaiah*, 625.  
*Bede*, Venerable, his *Church History*, 626.  
*Benevolent societies*, statistics of, 318.  
*Biblical interpretation*, 211, 321.  
*Bretschneider*, his *Greek Lexicon*, 626.  
*Brownson*, his *Chas. Elwood*, 419.  
*Bunyan*, his *Pilgrim's Progress*, 461.

### C.

*Centennial Addresses*, 47.  
*Charles Elwood*, by Brownson, 419.  
*Christmas*, its observance, 136.

*Christology*, Hengstenberg's, 630.

*Chrysostom*, his homilies, 613.

*City of God*, Augustine's, 69.

*Classical Education*, by Thiersch, 336.

*Classical Literature*, Eschenburg's, 289.

*Concordance*, Englishman's Greek, 132.

*Confessions of Augustine*, 74, 601.

*Crania Americana*, Morton's, 304.

*Credibility of the Gospels*, 568.

*Cyprian*, his *Treatises*, 604—his character and influence, 604—on the dress of virgins, 606—on the unity of the church, 609.

*Cyril*, his catechetical lectures, 602.

### D.

*Deists*, English, their influence on German theology, 255.

*Dictionaries*, German, by Fosdick, Weber and Heyse, 477.

*Doctrina Christiana* of Augustine, 80.

*Dupin*, his *Trial of Jesus*, 33.

### E.

*Education*, popular, its importance, 218, 386—movement in Massachusetts, 386—Mass. Board of, 386—classical, by Thiersch, 336.

*Elwood*, Chas., by Brownson, 419.

*Emerson*, Prof. R., his translation of Wiggers's History of Augustinism and Pelagianism, 308.

*England*, new books in, 150, 479, 634.

*Eschenburg*, his Manual of Classical Literature, 289.

*Evidences of Christianity*, 568.

**F.**

*Felton*, C. C., his translation of Menzel's German Literature, 533.

*Fiske*, Prof. N. W., his translation of Eschenburg's Manual, 289.

*Fosdick*, David Jr., his German Dictionary, 477.

*France*, its influence on German theology, 257.

*Franklin*, his Works, edited by Sparks, 315.

*Frederic the Great*, his religious influence on Germany, 239.

**G.**

*Geology*, Mantell's, 143.

*Geography*, Murray's Encyclopedia of, 148.

*German books*, new, 155, 477, 635. Gymnasium, 157.

Dictionaries, by Fosdick, Weber and Heyse, 477.

*Goodrich*, his Pictorial Geography, 127.

**H.**

*Happiness*, its connection with piety, 354.

*Hefele*, C. J., his edition of the Apostolic Fathers, 479.

*Hemans*, Mrs., religious character of her poetry, 23.

*Hensen*, on the apostle Paul, 182.

*Herschell*, his discourse on Natural Philosophy, 194.

*Heyse*, his German Dictionary of Foreign words, 477.

*History*, Mohammedan, 372.

*Hoffmann*, his bibliographical Manual, 144.

**I.**

*Inductive Philosophy*, 194.

*Infidel*, converted, by Brownson, 419.

*Influence of Mothers*, 442.

*Insanity* in the United States, 149.

*Intelligence*, Miscellaneous, 148, 318, 479, 631.

*Interpretation*, biblical, 211, 321—of figurative language, of maxims, &c., 321.

*Interpreter*, qualifications of, 211.

*Isaiah*, Notes on, by Barnes, 625.

**J.**

*Jesus*, Trial of, by Dupin, 33.

*Judas Iscariot*, 328—his history, 328—his treachery, 332—God's design in his history and fate, 333.

**K.**

*Kirkland*, President, his Life and Character, by Mr. Young, 472.

**L.**

*La Place*, 11, note.

*Learning*, men of, their obligations to religion, 161.

*Legal Rights of Woman*, 269—in Greece, 270—in Rome and in Asia, 271—in America, 273—her political rights, 273—her civil rights, 276—before marriage, 277—after marriage, 278—in respect to personal estate, 291—her liberty, 284—her privileges, 286.

*Lexicon*, Greek, Bretschneider's, 626.

*Literary Notices*, 127, 304, 472, 600.

*Literature*, Classical, 289, 336—list of books on, 293—Eschenburg's Manual of, 289—German, by Menzel, 533.

*Macaulay*, T. B., his miscellanies, 450.

*Maginnis*, Prof. J., his Inaugural Address, 128.

*Mantell*, his Geology, 143.

*Menzel*, his German Literature, 533

*Milne*, Rev. W., his Life, by Philip, 553.

*Ministry*, its influence in forming Christian character, 107.

*Miscellaneous Intelligence*, 148, 318, 479, 634.

*Missionary Enterprise*, its connection with the cause of learning, 580.

*Missions*, the present crisis, 138.

*Mohammedan History*, 372—Mohammed, 373—Abubeker, 375, —Omar, 377—Othman, 378—Ali, 379—Arabian parties, 380—the conquest of Spain, 383—change of the dynasty, 384—the Fatimites in Africa, 387—three caliphates, 388—the Seljuk Turks, 390.

*Morrison*, J. H., his Centennial Address, 47.

*Morton*, his *Crania Americana*, 304.

*Mothers*, their influence, 442.

*Murray*, his *Geography*, 148.

**N.**

*New Testament writers*, their credibility, 568.

**O.**

*Observatories*, 89.

**P.**

*Peabody*, his centennial Address, 47.

*Persecution*, impolitic, 33.

*Peterboro'*, in N.H., history of, 54.

*Philip*, Rev. R., his *Life of Milne*, 553.

*Philosophy*, inductive, 194—the Wolffian, 250.

*Pictorial Geography*, by Goodrich, 127.

*Piety*, its influence on the intellectual powers, 1—on happiness, 354—of Galileo and Kepler, 10, note,—of C. Ritter, 12, note.

*Plainness as a quality of Sermons*, 481.

*Pond*, Prof. E., on the Connection of the Missionary Enterprise with the Cause of Learning, 580.

*Popular Education*, 218, 386.

*Preaching*, plainness in, 481.

*Prejudice against Piety as hostile to happiness*, 354.

*Professional labor* indispensable to professional success, 230.

*Pulpit Eloquence*, by Theremin, 619—causes of failure in, by Wayland, 627.

*Pusey*, Rev. E. B., his translation of Augustine's *Confessions*, 601.

**R.**

*Rationalism*, German, history of, 243, 511—its gradual diffusion, 519.

*Religion*, its claims on men of learning, 161.

*Rhetoric*, by Theremin, 619.

*Rights of Woman*, legal, 269.

*Rome*, church at, by Hemsen, 182—not founded by Peter, 183—its history, 185—consisted of Jewish and Gentile converts, 187—the occasion of Paul's epistle to it, 192—object of the epistle, 193.

**S.**

*Salvador*, his Trial of Jesus, refuted by Dupin, 43.

*Schoolcraft*, his Algon researches, 474.

*Semler*, 260.

*Sermons*, plainness as a quality of, 481.

*Smithsonian bequest*, 89.

*Socialism*, 430—in France, 439.

*Spero*, his edition of Franklin's Works, 315.

**T.**

*Theology*, German, revolution in 243, 511—its state in 1750, 245—the new, its progress at the beginning of the nineteenth century, 511.

*Theremin*, his Rhetoric, 619.

*Thiersch* on Classical Education, 336.

*Tholuck*, his history of German Rationalism, 243, 511—his present philosophical views, 632.

*Trial of Jesus*, by Dupin, 33.

**U.**

*Universities*, German, Rationalism in, 519.

**W.**

*Wayland*, Rev. J., his address on the causes of failure in pulpit eloquence, 627.

*Weber*, his German Dictionary, 477.

*Wiggers*, his history of Augustinism and Pelagianism, 308.

*Wolf*, his philosophy, 250.

*Woman*, her legal rights, 269.

**Y.**

*Young*, his Discourse on the Life and Character of Kirkland, 472.